

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1882.

The Week.

MR. CONKLING has now definitively declined, in a letter to the President, the appointment to a seat on the Supreme Bench. This is undoubtedly the most satisfactory conclusion of the unfortunate affair. From the reception the nomination of Mr. Conkling for a high judicial office met with, President Arthur has had an opportunity to perceive that it would have been much better for him to follow the example set by himself in the appointment of Judge Gray, than to make a selection which everybody recognized at once as a political one. Some of the good opinion won by the appointment of Judge Gray and lost again by that of Mr. Conkling the President may retrieve, by now sending to the Senate the name of a jurist whom everybody will recognize as a fit man for our highest judicial tribunal, and whose nomination nobody will suspect of having been made for any other object than to serve the public interest. The nomination of Mr. Conkling has also served to show that what may be called the Garfield feeling, which, whether justly or unjustly, appears to be mainly directed against Mr. Conkling, is by no means dead yet. Neither is it confined to the Western Reserve in Ohio. It cropped out in more or less angry demonstrations all over the country when the news of Mr. Conkling's nomination went forth, and there is good reason to believe that it is just as strong in the rural districts of New York as in General Garfield's native State. The quiet citizen does not shake off strong impressions as easily as the active politician. This would very conclusively appear if, as has been suggested by some, the people were given an opportunity to vote directly for or against Mr. Conkling at a general election. The existence and strength of such a feeling may be deprecated, but it must be recognized as a fact. The talk of Mr. Conkling declining a seat on the Supreme Bench for the purpose of returning to active public life is therefore mere talk and nothing else. The first serious attempt would quickly convince him that his political future lies, for a considerable time at least, in the vast solitude of his grand and desolate self-appreciation.

The floods in the Ohio and Lower Missouri Valleys have passed out of those rivers, doing comparatively small damage, but have concentrated their devastating effects on the greatest cotton-raising region of the Southwest, which extends from Memphis southward to Natchez. Some thirty counties in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, bordering the Mississippi, White, and Red Rivers, are more or less submerged. The official reports from the State Commissioners of these States to the Secretary of War show that in these thirty counties there are now about fifty thousand people who have been driven from their homes, and are so destitute that they will have to be fed at the Government's expense for probably forty

days. The effects of this disaster upon the next cotton crop can scarcely yet be estimated. The cotton crop of the thirty counties in question is on the average from year to year greater than that of any other thirty counties in the South, and is all of the low grade which makes up the great bulk of the American cotton supply. The cotton crop of all that part of the South is usually finished—or "laid by," as it is called—preparatory to picking, early in July. Consequently, there are only four months in which to repair damages, plant and cultivate to maturity a crop of cotton. The great destruction of fences, houses, cotton gins, agricultural implements, mules, etc., will, in a large area of the flooded country render this impossible, and the yield of cotton from the thirty counties will unquestionably be so greatly diminished as to have an effect on the prices of the next crop.

The indictment against General Curtis for collecting assessments from Custom-house and Post-office employees has been handed into court, and he will accordingly soon be tried. The sums he thus obtained ranged from five to eighty dollars, and presumably came in every case from poor men, and were paid under duress. Not one of these would probably have felt, were he in the employment of a private firm, that he could afford to pay anything toward campaign funds, or at all events so much. Not one of them ought to have had the slightest private interest in the result of the election. No man's bread should be directly dependent on any election, or dependent on it at all except in so far as it is likely to affect legislation. General Curtis's defence is said to be that he is not an officeholder or employee of the United States Government within the terms of the statute, but it will disgust Mr. Thurlow Weed and all the Stalwarts if he puts in any such plea as this. He ought to take higher ground, and maintain, as Mr. Weed does, that the levying of assessments on officeholders is a noble and holy work, and that if it be necessary to suffer for it, he will be proud to do so.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the sugar case is of great importance to those sugar importers from whom the Custom-house has extracted about \$1,500,000 of duties, which are now pronounced illegal, and will have to be returned. To the sugar trade in general it is doubtless not of much importance, at least as regards the future, as Congress will probably now make the change in the test of quality which Secretary Sherman undertook to make for himself. But it is of very great importance to the whole community, as a check on the tendency to arbitrary practices which has prevailed in the administration of the customs ever since the war broke out, and which is the result in part of the protectionist prejudice against all importers, and in part of the war-begotten feeling that the collection of revenue for the Government was too important to allow of any nice or delicate consideration of private rights

which seemed to stand in its way. The matter, stripped of details, is simple enough. Congress has since 1861 prescribed a mode of ascertaining the value of sugar, which makes the color of the sugar the standard; the lighter the color the higher the value as a basis for duties. In the intervening years, however, manufacturers have managed to make the strength of the sugar, to a certain extent, independent of its color, so that, in short, a dark sugar shall really be as good a sugar as a much lighter one used to be, though still paying the old duty. The Custom-house undertook to meet this by substituting a new test, examination by the polariscope, in order to ascertain the strength of the sugar, and then tax it on the strength instead of the color. The Supreme Court now says that the Custom-house has no right to prescribe a new test, even if the old one is defective, and even if duties are evaded under it. This is the business of the Legislature, not of the Executive, and the Treasury must not attempt to remedy defects in legislation. Consequently all the duties levied under the polariscope test have to be returned, and the color test must still be used till changed by Congress.

The exports of domestic products during the week were not sufficient to furnish enough foreign bills of exchange to meet the demand for remittances to cover merchandise imports and the imports of securities, and the result was that it was necessary to export \$2,501,600 more specie, the larger part of which was gold. This brings the specie exports since January 1 up to \$11,291,340. At the close of the week the indications were that gold exports for the present were stopped, although the rates current still warranted them. The New York banks, although contracting their credits and reducing their deposit liabilities, again lost so heavily in reserve that they were short by the sum of \$2,618,050 of the 25 per cent. reserve which the national banks are by law required to keep. The Treasury, which for a long time has been taking in more money than it has paid out, began about the middle of the week the prepayment without rebate of the \$20,000,000 of 3½ per cent bonds included in the 107th call, which matures on the 13th instant. Thus far less than \$4,000,000 of these bonds have been presented for prepayment; but the money on this account and for interest on the public debt, of which interest \$2,800,000 was due on the 1st, have been sufficient to make the loan market easier for borrowers. During February the public debt was reduced \$9,783,511, making the total decrease since June 30 last \$97,869,442. At the Stock Exchange there was a strong market for securities early in the week, but later this was lost, and the suspension of the prominent banking and brokerage firm of C. A. Sweet & Co., of Boston, on Monday, added to the prevailing weakness. This firm was clogged with securities of new railroads, and was borrowing between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 cash on them from the Boston banks; the demand

of the latter for more "collaterals" was the cause of the failure. It is thought that the firm will pay in full, the senior partner being reported to have \$1,000,000 outside the business. In the foreign financial markets money is steadily becoming more plentiful, and rates for loans are declining, as is natural after such a collapse of speculation as was brought about by the failure of the Union Générale.

Mr. Miller, of California, made a great mistake in giving his Anti-Chinese Bill a preamble, because it makes the bill a little ridiculous. The bill forbids the immigration of Chinese laborers into the United States, because, says the preamble, "the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities." In other words, the country which owes a large part of its material greatness to the welcome it has accorded to foreigners, now proposes to pass one of the most exclusive laws ever put on the statute book of any country, directed against one of the most peaceable and industrious peoples on the globe, on the ground that their presence is in certain places likely to cause disturbances requiring the interference of the police. Doubtless Mr. Miller means a good deal more than this—that is, really believes that the Chinese work far more mischief in the United States than is involved in local disorder; but if so, he ought to have put all his fears in his preamble. The United States can hardly afford to put on record that, in order to keep the peace in certain localities, they had to pass a law of non-intercourse with a large and friendly empire. The bill which the preamble suggests would be a bill for the better protection of foreigners against native mobs, either by an increase of police, or an increase of the penalties now prescribed for assault and battery and riot. The presence of free negroes at the South after the war "endangered the good order" of a great many "localities," but no one proposed to meet the trouble by inviting the negroes to evacuate the country, or forbidding the entrance of all colored laborers from abroad. It was met by more stringent legislation for the protection of the blacks against white mobs, and by "waving the bloody shirt" at every election.

Moreover, how can we find fault with the Russian Government for permitting the maltreatment and expulsion of the Jews, if we ourselves proclaim that a popular race prejudice releases us from our obligations toward an obnoxious class in the matter of internal police? The truth is, that the bill is passed to carry out the treaty lately concluded with China for the restriction of Chinese immigration, and that treaty was called for by the hostility of the white population of the Pacific Coast, to the Chinese immigrants, on account of the cheapness of their labor, their alleged immorality, and the impossibility of their assimilating with or being absorbed by the Caucasians and Africans who are already in possession of the country. It is desirable both for our own credit and the truth of history that, in making such a marked change in our policy toward foreign immigration as this legislation involves, the true reasons for it, if any whatever, should be given. There should be no evasion of the real issue,

because the legislation in question recognizes in the broadest way the political and social importance of race differences, which all through the controversy over the negroes the Republican party at the North has steadily denied, and insisted that the South should ignore in reconstructing itself after the war.

In the debate on the Anti-Chinese Bill Mr. Farley denied that the Chinese had ever shown any aptness in the arts and sciences or any inventive faculty, and was apparently cornered by Mr. Hoar, who asked who invented the printing press, the mariner's compass, and gunpowder. It seemed at first blush as if escape was here impossible; but Mr. Farley is a man of resource and not to be caught in that way, and he promptly replied that by Chinese he meant the Chinese laborers—in other words, the class whose coming to this country is prohibited by the pending bill. Of course this floored Mr. Hoar, who could not maintain that Chinese laborers had attained to any proficiency in the arts and sciences, and that it was a horny-handed Chinaman who had invented gunpowder and printing and the compass. Mr. Jones, however, got the better of Mr. Hoar more completely, for he denied that the world was indebted for these things to Chinamen of any class; for, he said, the Chinese had stolen them from Caucasian travellers who happened to be in their country, but he shrewdly declined to give the names of the travellers, or to mention the date at which the Chinese had played this trick on them.

Mr. Montgomery Blair has written to Mr. Miller in support of the Anti-Chinese Bill, in the character of a "thoughtful lover of his country," and gives as a reason for not "countenancing this Mongolian invasion" the assertion that it "involves primarily the subversion of our civilization," and says that Mr. Hoar seems "intent on submerging us with Asiatics." A "thoughtful lover of his country" is always a respectable character, though he is sometimes both a blockhead and a bore. But then a well-informed lover of his country is something much more useful. We regret to say that we cannot place Mr. Blair in this last-named category. He has written about "the Mongolian invasion" without knowing what he was talking about. There are, according to the best authorities, not more than 100,000 Chinamen in the United States, and their number has sensibly decreased since 1870, and is likely to decrease. It is not in the power of 100,000 men of any race to "subvert the civilization" of 50,000,000. There has never been anything in recent politics so absurd as the terror, real or affected, about the numbers of the Chinese, except the pretence of the San Francisco hoodlums that they compete with them in the labor market. There is hardly a lazy vagabond or tramp in the United States who does not try to believe that the Chinaman is keeping him out of work.

The Coinage Committee of the House of Representatives have reported a curious bill, accompanied by a still more curious report, on the subject of silver dollars and gold dollars, silver bullion and gold bullion, silver

certificates and gold certificates. The bill first makes the standard silver dollar the "unit of value." There is an existing statute, by the way, which makes the gold dollar the unit of value, and this statute is not repealed by the proposed bill. The bill then provides that holders of silver bullion may deposit it at the Sub-Treasury in any amount, and receive "the market value thereof" in silver certificates, in denominations not less than five dollars, these certificates to be receivable for customs duties and taxes of all kinds. Under the operation of this bill, if it should pass, the first question would be: "What is the market value of silver bullion when the silver dollar is itself the unit of value?" Can it be anything else than that 412½ grains are equal to a dollar? Evidently the Committee thought it would be something different. Otherwise they would have said nothing about market value, but would have provided that holders of silver bullion might deposit the same at the Sub-Treasury and receive certificates therefor at the rate of one dollar for each 412½ grains. In order to give any point or efficiency to their proviso regarding the market value of silver, the unit of value must be something different from silver. In making silver itself the unit of value, and then providing for its acceptance at the Treasury at its market value, the Committee have perpetrated an Irish bull of the most muscular sort, and we need not remind them that such an animal is never more out of place than in the public mint. Their ignorance is equally well advertised in the report accompanying the bill.

The exposure of frauds in the government of Philadelphia may be expected to move more rapidly now that the reformers have got possession of the local legislature. It appears from the report of an investigating committee that a citizen, whose tax-bills during the last eight years have amounted to more than \$100,000, upon making sale of a piece of property discovered liens for unpaid taxes upon it of more than \$750. The citizen produced receipted tax-bills, but the ward collector had returned the property as delinquent. This theft by a minor swindler suggests the possible magnitude of the operations of the greater rings. The Gas Trust has been more than suspected, and the late election was a desperate effort, happily unsuccessful, to guarantee the further concealment of its doings. Philadelphia is sometimes regarded as a jealous rival of New York. In municipal mismanagement she certainly has held her own. In the continuance of outright stealing—as in this matter of tax thefts—she has fairly outstripped us. The fact that Philadelphia is a Republican city while New York is Democratic shows that administrative corruption is not a party matter. In one respect we have had the advantage of our neighbor—or ought to have had. A party in power at the State capital might be expected to exert a restraint upon the opposite party in power in the city, and to expose its shortcomings. As a matter of fact, however, the Republicans at Albany have not held this wholesome relation to the Democrats in New York; and even at this late day the former are found in a real or suspected alliance

with the Tammany ring, which makes any movement for municipal reform almost hopeless, if, as in the case of the firemen and police salary job, it does not actually make things worse than they are.

The list of governments, corporations, firms, and individuals engaged in settling the trouble between Chili and Peru is a long one, but it has been increased during the past week by the addition of Peter Hevener, who "claims" to be the principal owner of both the Cochet and Landreau claims against Peru. This new mediator has intervened in the quarrel by beginning proceedings for embezzlement against Mr. James B. Mantrop in the courts of Pennsylvania. Mr. Hevener, who is described as "a fine-looking man about sixty years old," tells on the whole a very straight though rather pathetic story of his Peruvian adventures. He did not himself invent the guano claims, but "for more than a quarter of a century he was the most prominent and active contractor in South America," which is saying a great deal, but not a word too much when we learn that under his supervision millions of dollars were expended in building reservoirs, driving tunnels, erecting public buildings, and constructing railroads, to say nothing of "laying water-mains across miles of arid plains to the tops of waterless mountains," perhaps for purposes of irrigation; while at one time, in addition to all this, he owned "five wholesale stores" in Lima. In 1840 Cochet discovered guano, and thereby became entitled to the reward of one-third of the value of the discovery offered by the Peruvian Government; but, like so many other discoverers, he never realized anything from it, and died in an almshouse in Paris, leaving an only son, who fell heir, of course, to his poor father's claims against Peru, amounting when he came of age in round numbers to \$500,000,000. To this son there now appeared a benevolent friend in the person of Hevener, who advanced him sums of money from time to time to push his claims, when, after \$50,000 had been spent in this way, Landreau suddenly turned up, stoutly insisting that it was he and not Cochet who discovered guano—though whether the same guano or some other guano does not clearly appear. At any rate, Hevener, who evidently knows all that there is to be known about the philosophy of claims, came to the conclusion that it was better to lend Landreau money than to "antagonize" him; and in this way he became in a short time the owner of nearly all the Landreau claim. What has become of young Cochet is not stated, but apparently he has no longer any interest in the Cochet claim, which has passed, like that of Landreau, into the hands of the benevolent Hevener. He says that the whole is "ready for collection," and adds: "If Peru is smart, she will pay the \$900,000,000" (this probably includes the interest account) "at once, and not allow the debt to accumulate."

It seems doubtful whether the man who fired at Queen Victoria on Thursday really intended to kill her. He says himself that he was led to the act by hunger; in other words, he knew that if he could get himself arrested he would

be sent to jail and so get some food. No bullet marks were found on the Queen's carriage. The man, whose name is Roderick MacLean, is described as a miserable looking object, and suspicions of his sanity were at first entertained. He has, however, been pronounced sane by the physicians who have examined him. He is twenty-four years old, and calls himself a "grocer's assistant." His punishment will probably be severe flogging and imprisonment. The affair, of course, has not the slightest significance, and the Queen does not seem to have even been frightened by the attempt. Messages of sympathy have been telegraphed from the Russian, Austrian, and German courts, and the feeling which led to them will be shared by everybody in this country. The event vividly recalls the warm-hearted expressions of sympathy by the Queen herself over the murder of the late President, and would half incline us to exaggerate the danger to which she has been exposed in order that we might the better express our gratification at her escape.

The reflection of Bradlaugh by his old constituency is an embarrassing thing both for the Ministry and for the Opposition. Mr. Gladstone cannot any longer treat the matter as an indifferent one, on which his supporters can follow their own bent. Bradlaugh at first refused the oath on the ground that it would not be binding on his conscience, but offered and was allowed to affirm. The courts decided he had no right to affirm, and, his seat being declared vacant, he was reelected. On coming up the second time he offered to take the oath, and said it would be binding on his conscience. But the Tories, and many Liberals, now said: "No; we will not let you take it now, for it would be profanation. What you said about it the first time was true; what you say now is false; besides, you are a wicked man, and we will not let you sit, if we can help it, in this religious assembly, where everybody believes in God and leads a pure life." And Mr. Gladstone said in substance: "This is very silly; you have no right to judge whether this man is sincere in taking the oath or not, and if I were you, I would let him in; but you may do as you please about it." And the result was that Bradlaugh was expelled, and has been a third time elected, and the Ministry must now take control of the matter, either by insisting that Bradlaugh be allowed to take the oath or by bringing in a bill providing a form of affirmation for all—and not Quakers only—who refuse to take an oath, and making its passage a test of their strength. On the other hand, the Tories are placed in the very awkward dilemma of having either to maintain persistently that it is for the majority of the House and not for the member himself to determine whether the oath is binding on a member's conscience, or to acknowledge, by now admitting Bradlaugh, that their previous opposition to him was frivolous.

Lord Redesdale is apparently about to try to settle the Bradlaugh question by bringing in a bill excluding atheists from Parliament. There is not much chance that anything of

the kind would pass, even if proposed by a person whose judgment was in better repute than Lord Redesdale's. There are probably no atheists in the House of Commons, meaning by that persons who deny the existence of a God as an article of faith; but there is undoubtedly a very large number of Agnostics, or persons who declare themselves unable to say whether there is a God or not, and a still larger number who are utterly opposed to making professions of religious belief a qualification for office of any kind. In fact, Bradlaugh draws a great deal of whatever strength there is in his position from the widely diffused belief of the public that the House of Commons will not bear examination as a religious body. The House of Lords would doubtless fare better, as far as profession goes—most, if not all, peers feeling it to be due to their position to cultivate a believing frame of mind, and being deeply sensible of the dependence of the throne on the altar. It has always been difficult to get them to agree to the abolition of any religious qualification for office—even that sacramental test which long made it necessary for a man to take the communion from an Anglican minister before he could fill certain places.

Mr. Lowell has got into a "dungeon" trouble with an American Fenian named MacSweeney, who returned to his native country to engage in political agitation, and was arrested under the Coercion Act, and was, when he brought his case to Mr. Lowell's notice, confined in what he called "Victoria's dungeon," at Dundalk. Whenever an American Fenian is arrested by the British Government he is, curiously enough, always put into a "dungeon," the ordinary jail being apparently reserved for British subjects; and when he begins to call for deliverance at the hands of this Government, by the invasion of England, or the bombardment of London, as may be deemed most expedient, it is from a dungeon that his cries always issue. Mr. Lowell's reply to MacSweeney was in substance that when he began agitating in Ireland he was aware that the Coercion Act was in force; that in being locked up, he was, barring the dungeon, treated like the Queen's own subjects, and that he must have known before he began his work the perils to which he was exposed. This MacSweeney treated as the mockery of "an American citizen in chains," and drew from Mr. Lowell's talk the bold inference that he (Mr. Lowell) "held that if an American should in Ireland take part in a public meeting—say a prayer meeting—or engage in a public discussion with an Englishman, or a Frenchman, or a Zulu, he would forfeit the right to an appeal even to the courtesy of the Government." This startling proposition Mr. Lowell did not attempt to deny, but said he had tried vainly to get Lord Granville to let MacSweeney out of the dungeon, or to say why Victoria had put him into it. The result was that MacSweeney passed sixteen months in chains, and naturally feels sore about it, and wishes that some arrangement could be made under which Irish-Americans could go back to Ireland and set the British Government at defiance without exposure to dungeons and fetters.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

DOMESTIC

On Thursday afternoon the Senate, by a vote of 39 to 12, confirmed Mr. Conkling's nomination to the Associate Justiceship of the Supreme Court. On Monday the President received a letter from Mr. Conkling declining the office.

It was reported on good authority in Washington on Tuesday that the President had offered the position of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court to Mr. Edmunds, and that he had declined it on the ground that his health would not permit him to undertake the arduous duties of the position.

Mr. Miller's Anti-Chinese Immigration Bill has occupied the attention of the Senate during the week. On Wednesday Senator Hoar delivered a long speech in opposition to the bill. On Thursday Senators Grover, of Oregon, and Farley, of California, spoke in favor of it. The debate was continued on Friday, Monday, and Tuesday. The Senators from the Pacific slope are all in favor of the bill, and some of the Eastern Senators, including Mr. Bayard, take the ground that Congress ought not to disregard the substantially unanimous wish of the people of California, as expressed at the polls, for absolute prohibition of Chinese immigration. Mr. Edmunds, too, has spoken on the same side.

Captain Eads's proposition to carry vessels across the Isthmus of Panama on a railroad, as embodied in a bill to incorporate the Inter-Oceanic Ship Railway Company, has been favorably reported to the Senate from the Committee on Commerce. It is stated that opposition to the bill in the committee was withheld as a compliment to the introducer, with the understanding that Senators who were opposed to it should have an opportunity to manifest their opposition by speech and vote.

On Monday the Senate passed the joint resolution for the return and remission of duties on the revised New Testament.

The House passed the Indian Appropriation Bill on Wednesday. The total amount appropriated is \$4,920,203, an increase of \$351,600 over the bill of last year.

The bill introduced by Mr. S. S. Cox, and which passed the House, to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service, was passed by the Senate on Thursday, with amendments which provide for pensioning employees of the service.

A resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, providing for a joint committee to attend the celebration at New Orleans next month of the two hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi River by La Salle, was laid on the table by a strong majority on Tuesday.

The Tariff Commission Bill, reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means, will probably not come up for discussion until very late in the session, as it has been ruled that it is not a bill for raising revenue and cannot, therefore, take precedence of appropriation bills, but must wait its turn on the general calendar of the Committee of the Whole.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs began on Monday the investigation, under the Kasson resolution, of the alleged abstraction of certain papers from the files of the State Department. The committee conducted the investigation with closed doors, but the Democratic members of the committee desire to have a public investigation, and it is thought possible that a resolution to this effect may be adopted.

On Tuesday the President received Baron Ignatz von Schaeffer, the new Austrian Minister, and Mr. Romero, Special Envoy of the Mexican Government, who is in Washington with a view to entering into negotiations for a treaty of reciprocity between Mexico and the United States. It is understood that Mr.

Romero, within the limits of certain instructions, has been accorded full discretionary power to act for his Government.

The President has approved the Immediate Deficiency Bill, the Act to establish post routes, the Act to establish a port of delivery at Denver, Colorado, and the Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish impressions of the cards of invitation to the Garfield memorial services.

The Treasury Department was informed on Tuesday of an attempt to smuggle about a ton of opium, on board the steamship *City of Tokio*, through the San Francisco Customhouse, and that when the offenders were arrested they offered to give the whole quantity of opium and \$10,000 in addition to be released.

Postmaster-General Howe has transmitted a letter to the House in reply to the resolution calling for a list of all resignations, removals, and appointments made in the Post-office Department since March 4, 1881. Mr. Howe says that promotions, so far as he has been able to learn, have been uniformly made with regard to the merit and capacity of the employees. All candidates for promotion or appointment above the grade of a thousand dollars have been examined by a board to ascertain their qualifications, and in several instances these examinations have been competitive.

The contract division of the Post-office has sent out nearly 3,000 notifications to successful Star-route contractors, informing them of the acceptance of their proposals for service. The aggregate sum of the bids is about \$4,000,000. A. E. Boone, one of the contractors now under indictment for conspiracy, has secured a large number of the awards.

The Washington Grand Jury brought in a second batch of indictments in the straw-bond and Star-route cases on Wednesday, and on Saturday the indictments for conspiracy in connection with the Star-route mail service against Brady, the Dorseys, and others, were formally presented in the Criminal Court. Colonel Bliss will endeavor to have the trial set for as early a day as possible, and hopes to begin it next month. It is thought that the defendants will move to quash the indictment and ask that an investigation be made to discover whether the evidence was properly presented to the Grand Jury. The prosecution, however, state that the hearing was properly conducted in every way, and that they have left no loophole of escape. The evidence in the other cases will be laid before the new Grand Jury which comes in this week.

The Board of Army Engineers appointed to consider the matter have made a preliminary report recommending the reclamation of the Potomac flats. It is estimated that the cost of the whole work will be \$2,500,000.

The Mississippi River continues to rise, and more levees are giving way every day. The Secretary of War and the State Governments of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Kentucky are sending supplies and doing all they can to aid the sufferers by the flood.

A large meeting of Kentucky Republicans was held in Louisville on Thursday, at which resolutions condemning the coalition with the Anti-Bourbon Democrats were adopted.

The Executive Committee of the Republican State Central Committee of Tennessee have unanimously recommended Republicans to vote for a Constitutional Convention to settle the question of the State debt. The Republicans of the State are said to be generally in favor of settling the debt on the best terms that the creditors may voluntarily offer.

The sub-committee of the Finance Committee of the City Councils of Philadelphia, which has been engaged in investigating the Tax Office defalcation, has made a report to the full committee, from which it appears that a system of peculation has been carried on for years by nearly all of the clerks employed in the Tax Office, resulting from the "negligent,

if not criminal manner, in which the department was conducted."

It is thought probable that Governor Cameron, of Virginia, will call an extra session of the Legislature for the purpose of acting upon Senator Mahone's scheme for redistricting the State so as to give the Readjusters at least eight out of the ten members of the House of Representatives to which Virginia is entitled.

The Republicans of South Carolina held a conference at Columbia on Thursday to consider questions affecting the rights and interests of the Republicans of the State. It was decided to ask the Federal Government to make suitable provision to obtain legal registration, under the Federal election law, of all the voters in the State. The State Executive Committee will probably draw up a memorial to Congress on the subject.

The court-martial which has been trying Sergeant Mason for his attempt on the life of Guiteau completed its labors on Thursday. The proceedings of the board will be submitted to Major Gardner, Judge-Advocate of the Army, who will review the evidence and findings, and will submit the record of the case, with such comment as he sees fit, to General Hancock. It then rests with General Hancock to approve or set aside the verdict rendered by the court-martial.

The death rate in New York city has increased five hundred a month for the past two months, which is far too large to be accounted for by any increase in the population, nor can any satisfactory reason for the increase be given, since January and February are usually healthy months.

Steps are being taken in this city to provide properly for the Jewish refugees who are expected soon to reach this country from Russia. Already nearly 3,000 of these exiles have come to New York from southern Russia, and nearly 1,000 are now on their way, and before the summer the number of arrivals is expected to be increased to 10,000.

The six days go-as-you-please walking match in New York was finished on Saturday. Hazael won the race by covering 600 miles. He will probably get about \$19,000 as his share of the prizes and gate money.

The Inman line steamer *City of Berlin*, which was nine days overdue, was towed into port at Boston on Sunday by the Cunard steamer *Samaria*. The screw shaft of the *City of Berlin* became disabled on the 22d of February, and from that day until the 27th, when she was sighted by the French steamship *Ville d'Alger*, she drifted about under sail. The *Ville d'Alger* gave her some assistance until the following day, when the *Samaria* was sighted, which took her in tow for Boston.

FOREIGN.

Queen Victoria was fired at as she was entering her carriage at the Windsor railway station, on Thursday evening, but escaped unhurt. The would-be assassin, who is represented as a miserable-looking object, was at once arrested. An attempt was made by the crowd to lynch him, but the police succeeded in carrying him off. His name is Roderick MacLean, and he is said to be a grocer's assistant. His family solicitor writes that he possesses certificates of eminent physicians of the existence of mental aberration in the prisoner, of long standing, and that there will be no difficulty in establishing the fact of his insanity. He adds that MacLean is the same person who attempted to wreck a railway train in 1874, and that the report that two doctors at Windsor had declared him sane is untrue. Meanwhile congratulatory despatches have been pouring in to the Queen from all parts of the world. In the House of Commons on Monday, Mr. Gladstone, in moving the address to the Queen, said that similar attempts upon the lives of rulers in other countries had been associated with some grievance or discontent, whereas the attempt upon the Queen

was prompted solely by a morbid desire for notoriety in an intellect of the narrowest kind.

Mr. Forster, Chief Secretary for Ireland, was invited by the House of Lords Committee to give evidence at the inquiry of the committee into the working of the Land Act. The invitation included an important statement in regard to the scope of their inquiry, which was designed as a basis of agreement on the issue raised between the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The Cabinet held a special meeting to consider the matter, and decided that neither the form nor the substance of the communication justified their acceptance of it as a settlement of the question raised by the House of Lords, and Mr. Forster was directed to decline to give testimony before the committee.

The statement included in the House of Lords committee's invitation to Mr. Forster was that the committee do not consider it within the scope of their inquiry to discuss the correctness of any of the commissioners' decisions. This is looked upon in some quarters as a practical surrender of the original position taken by the House of Lords.

The debate on Mr. Gladstone's resolution was continued on Thursday. Mr. Sexton made an attack on the administration of the Land Act. He stated that out of 70,000 applications to the Land Court, only 1,313 cases had been decided within the past three months, the result being that it would take years to adjudicate the entire number, and that meanwhile the tenants whose cases remained undecided would be forced to pay back rents.

The election at Northampton on Thursday to fill the vacancy in the House of Commons caused by Mr. Bradlaugh's expulsion, again resulted in his return. The vote was 3,798 for Mr. Bradlaugh, against 3,687 for Mr. Corbett. At a meeting of the Opposition members of the House of Commons on the same evening it was decided to resist any attempt on the part of Mr. Bradlaugh to take his seat.

On Monday in the House of Commons Sir Stafford Northcote moved that the House reaffirm its resolution of February 7 that Mr. Bradlaugh be not allowed to go through the form of repeating the words of the oath. Mr. Majoribanks then moved an amendment in favor of legislation permitting affirmation. Mr. Gladstone supported the amendment as the best means of relieving the House from its increasingly painful position, but notwithstanding this it was defeated by a vote of 257 to 242. Sir Stafford Northcote's motion was then carried without a division. Mr. Majoribanks then gave notice that he would ask leave to bring in a bill amending the law in regard to the oath.

There was a "scene" in the House of Commons on Friday in consequence of the admission of Mr. Johnson, Attorney-General for Ireland, that a warrant under the Coercion Act existed against Mr. O'Connor, Home Rule member of the House for Queens county. Mr. O'Connor moved an adjournment, and inquired with what offence he was charged. Finally an endeavor was made to exact a pledge from the Government that it would not cause the arrest of members visiting their constituents, but Mr. Gladstone refused to grant such immunity or to give any further information.

Mr. Forster, Chief Secretary of Ireland, has been making a tour of inspection through the disaffected districts, and it is expected that it will be productive of substantial benefit. The fearlessness with which he moves about is everywhere commended. In a speech at Tullamore, County Kings, on Monday, Mr. Forster said that he had come to the disturbed districts to see for himself whether the reports of outrages were correct. He announced that as soon as the outrages ceased the suspects would be released.

A Parliamentary return shows that up to February 24th, 72,408 applications had been made to the Land Court to fix fair rents; that

the parties agreed between themselves in 2,180 cases, and that 2,365 cases were decided by the Court.

A judgment was recently given by the Court of Appeals at Dublin, in the matter of the appeal from the decision of the commissioners under the Land Act, on the reduction of a tenant's improved fixed-lease rent, the principal effect of which will be to limit the improvement for which a tenant cannot be charged increased rent to works actually executed by him.

A deputation "representing thousands of unemployed persons" waited on the Lord Mayor of London on March 1st, to ask his advice and aid in regard to emigration. He advised them to confer with Sir Alexander Galt, High Commissioner for Canada, and promised his assistance if any scheme of emigration was devised.

The Russo-Jewish Committee in London has prepared a statement, founded upon letters from persons occupying high official positions in the Jewish community and upon personal evidence of Jewish refugees. It confirms the reports of the outrages upon the Jews which were discredited by the recent British consular reports.

The Queen's monument to Lord Beaconsfield has been erected in Hughenden Church. It bears the inscription, "This memorial is placed here by a grateful and affectionate sovereign and friend. Victoria R. I. Kings love him that speaketh right."

The returns issued by the Board of Trade show that during the month of February British imports had decreased, compared with the same month last year, by £600,000, and the exports had increased by £2,100,000.

The latest in regard to General Skobelev's famous speech is that it was submitted to General Ignatieff before it was delivered, and that he struck out several pages. Skobelev, however, "allowed himself to be carried away by champagne, and took no account of the erasure when he delivered the speech." The Czar is reported to be very much "distressed and annoyed" by the effect of the speech, and has written to the Emperor William explaining the whole matter. Skobelev has been "interviewed" a number of times on his journey to St. Petersburg in regard to it, and expresses great surprise that his remarks should have created such a sensation, and repeats that he spoke only as a private individual, and that the same sentiments are expressed every day in all parts of Russia without any notice being taken of it.

Advices from St. Petersburg state that General Ignatieff's policy is so distasteful to M. de Giers, of the Foreign Office, and M. Bunge, Minister of Finance, that they have tendered their resignations, and that the fact that Count Valuyeff has recently had private audiences with the Czar, has given rise to rumors that he is to become Minister of the Interior to succeed General Ignatieff.

Russia has demanded priority for her claim on the Rumelian treasury of 23,000,000 francs for the maintenance of the Russian army of occupation. The Porte contends that it is for the powers who signed the treaty to decide as to the amount due Russia, and also that the amount of revenue the Russians collected while occupying the province should be deducted from the claim.

A Berlin correspondent writes that emigration from Germany to America promises to be very much greater this year than last.

During the months of January and February 12,655 emigrants left Hamburg for the United States.

The opposition displayed in the Prussian Economical Council to the Tobacco Monopoly Bill has surprised and annoyed Prince Bismarck, who counted upon the Council's vote as a standpoint to be used in the Bundesrath against the opposition of the South German States.

A despatch from Belgrade announces that on Monday, at the unanimous invitation of the Skuptschina, Prince Milan accepted the title of King of Serbia. The diplomatic body was thereupon acquainted of the fact, and the Austrian Minister soon afterward conveyed to Prince Milan the congratulations of the Emperor Francis Joseph.

It is understood that Russia, Austria, and Germany assented to the elevation of the principality of Serbia to a kingdom, and that Italy and Germany have recognized the kingdom.

It is officially announced from Vienna that the Austrians have captured Ulog after a desperate resistance.

The Austrian military authorities in the insurgent provinces have received strict orders to prevent the despatch of any reports whatever, except such as are official, in regard to military movements, and it is stated that the correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian* in Dalmatia (Mr. Evans, son-in-law of Mr. Freeman, the historian) has been ordered to quit Austria within three days. Two persons have been arrested at Ragusa for assisting Mr. Evans to spread news of insurgent victories.

The Cyril and Methodius Slavic Society of Odessa, in order to testify its sympathy with the Herzegovinians and Krivoschians, has unanimously elected a prominent insurgent leader an honorary member, and has applied to the Government for permission to organize subscriptions in aid of the refugees in Montenegro. Generals Gourko and Skobelev were also elected honorary members.

A despatch from Tunis says that the insurgents have reappeared in the vicinity of Sfax, where they have raided on the tribes which have submitted to the French. The news from the Regency is, however, on the whole, satisfactory. Two battalions of troops have returned to France. M. Roustan has requested the liberation of Taid Bey, who is imprisoned for conspiracy against the Bey.

On Monday the French Chamber of Deputies voted to consider a proposal for the abrogation of the Concordat. M. de Freycinet approved its consideration.

A despatch from Paris states that the French Cabinet has approved the plan of Admiral Jauréguiberry, Minister of Marine, for a scientific expedition to the south pole in coöperation with other powers.

A meeting of Socialists is to be held in Paris to protest against the sentences recently passed on the Nihilists at St. Petersburg.

Four hundred rifles have been discovered in connection with a plot in Catalonia, Spain. They are believed to be the property of Carlists.

A decree has been published convoking the Spanish Cortes for the 20th instant.

In the Spanish Cabinet on Monday the bill of the Minister of Justice introducing the provisions of the press law into the penal code, and repealing special legislation in regard to press offences, was discussed.

The Greek Chamber, after a three days' debate, has invalidated the seat of the Minister of War by a vote of 144 to 99.

The twin monuments erected over the graves of the poet Keats and his friend Joseph Severn were unveiled at the Protestant Cemetery at Rome on Sunday. Mr. T. A. Trollope presided at the ceremony, and Mr. Story, the American sculptor, delivered a speech. There were many English and American residents present.

A meeting is reported to have taken place in Lima, Peru, with a view to the organization of a new Government, of which Pierola is to be a prominent member. Dr. Antonio Arenas is spoken of for the Presidency. An executive committee, composed of prominent men, was appointed to start a popular movement in favor of a new and strong administration.

A "SPIRITED FOREIGN POLICY."

THE Consular and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill gave occasion in the House of Representatives for what is figuratively called "letting off steam." This bill has not unfrequently served to open the floodgates of gorgeous and harmless blood-and-thunder eloquence, and it might this time, as frequently before, be passed over without serious notice were we not informed by reports from Washington that the speech of Mr. Whitthorne of Tennessee was to sound the "keynote" of a new departure, a living issue to be made by the Democratic party. It appears that the Democratic party seriously thinks of giving the country a "spirited foreign policy," the principal modern features of which it has borrowed from Mr. Blaine. This is the subject upon which Mr. Whitthorne grew eloquent. The impression he evidently desired to convey was that Mr. Blaine's way of carrying on our foreign policy was "the thing," and that Mr. Frelinghuysen's was not, being governed by "the shadow of Wall Street's speculative capital," and that the Democratic party was therefore bound to have the former.

It will be useful to our Democratic friends, before they commit themselves, to inquire what kind of a "spirited foreign policy" will commend itself to the good sense of the American people. If it is one which will resent an insult when it is offered to us; which will protect the rights and safety of American citizens abroad whenever and wherever they are threatened; which will clearly ascertain what our interests are, and then enforce them with justice, intelligence, and dignity; which will maintain friendly relations with weaker states, and use our influence for their benefit when they call upon us to do so, and when it can be done without prejudice to their rights, then we are all agreed. Such a foreign policy we ought to have. But when a "spirited foreign policy" means that we should construe every difference of opinion as an insult for the purpose of having something to resent; that we should constantly carry a chip on our shoulder, daring anybody to knock it off; that we should use every possible occasion to "twist the tail of the British lion" for the fun of it; that we should have our finger in every quarrel merely to make our influence felt, and act the universal bully, shaking our fists in everybody's face to inform the world that we can "whip all creation," then the sober judgment of the American people will be that the less we have of such a "spirited foreign policy" the better for our good name as well as our true interests.

The fact is that the indiscriminate screaming of the eagle could really gratify the American people only in their boyish days, when a lingering doubt of their own strength impelled them to force the respect of foreign nations by frequent and vociferous self-assertion. We have got beyond that now. The American people have grown to man's estate. When a business man is rising in fortune, but is not yet recognized, he may think that blazing diamonds on his shirt-front will impress others with his wealth. When his success is sufficiently established and known, the same man will feel that it becomes him to be

simple, and that ostentatious display will injure his reputation for good sense. The American republic has grown so great that it can afford to maintain the self-restraint and undemonstrative dignity of conscious strength without being misjudged by anybody as to its power. That power is universally recognized, and no intelligent European statesman would think for a moment of disputing its superiority on this continent. If we, after the tremendous change of circumstances which has taken place, still exhibit the same sensitiveness and alarm about the possibility of European encroachment on this side of the Atlantic which with greater reason we might have shown forty or fifty years ago, we shall only persuade European powers that we ourselves are not so sure of our superiority here as they have thought us to be.

Of the practical working of the "spirited foreign policy" in the boyish sense, we have already had some instructive illustrations. We, too, think that this republic should have predominant influence over an inter-oceanic canal when it is built, and that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty should be and will in the course of time be modified. But when Mr. Whitthorne speaks of the "steps taken by Mr. Blaine to modify the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty," it may justly be said that Mr. Blaine has really taken steps to prevent its modification. For, while British statesmen may have come to the conclusion that the exercise of controlling influence by the United States of an inter-oceanic canal may in the course of time be inevitable, and while they may be willing to "be let down easy" in that respect, Mr. Blaine put the matter before them in language unnecessarily offensive to their self-respect, which makes an early accord more than usually difficult. We, too, are in favor of exercising a conciliatory influence in the quarrels of our sister republics, and even of mediating between them when called upon by them to do so. But we do not consider advisable the "spirited policy" of uncalled-for meddling which came near involving us in a most unnecessary war, and has resulted in the necessity of severely checking one of our foreign ministers who was negotiating for a railroad, and of investigating the proceedings of another whose business house made contracts the execution of which was conditioned upon the success of diplomatic action he himself was engaged in. We, too, think that a war may sometimes become necessary, but we are also convinced that a war is not a good thing for a republic, and ought, whenever possible, to be avoided. We, too, think the commercial interests of the United States deserve intelligent consideration. But we are sure that every attempt to restore the foreign commerce of this country by diplomatic tricks instead of sensible economic legislation will prove delusive and futile.

What the American people want is a just, sober, sensible, and dignified foreign policy. If the Democrats think they can carry public opinion, and thereby a Presidential election, by presenting a programme that is "spirited" enough to disturb our peaceful relations with the world, they only prove again that whenever there is a blunder to be made the Democratic party is sure to jump at the chance.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN MINISTERS.

IN a recent interview, the Rev. Dr. Bevan, of the Brick Church of this city, gave the reasons for his approaching return to England, his native country, after five years' residence here. It will probably take most people by surprise that he should think of returning, in view of the readiness with which several English and Irish ministers have of late years accepted calls addressed to them by churches on this side of the water, and in view also of the fact that similar invitations from England to ministers here have not been successful. Most, if not all, of the English ministers who have been called by American congregations have been Dissenters, and have come to take charge of churches which in England would be Dissenting churches. The American notion has hitherto been that English Dissenting ministers were glad to escape from the position of social, if not political, inferiority in which the existence of the Established Church and the traditions of English society place them, and get to a country in which one minister or one denomination is as good as another. This same view has, we believe, prevented any American minister (not an Anglican) of note from accepting any offer, however flattering, of a settlement in England. No American minister cares to leave a society in which he is as good as the best, for one in which he would occupy a distinctly second-rate position socially, and in which the upper clergy of another denomination would think and talk of association and coöperation with him as signs of unusual liberality of mind. Some of the recent pastoral utterances on this subject of the broader English bishops have in fact been, in their very effusiveness toward Dissenters, what an American might consider a little insulting.

Dr. Bevan, however, seems to take no account of this whatever. His reasons for going back are two: one, that he likes the London climate better than this, believing it to be a climate in which a man can do more work with impunity; the other, that in London the minister of any denomination has a much wider sphere of usefulness open to him than in New York. The meteorological reason we shall not undertake to discuss. The second is very interesting. He said:

"Your professional men, especially clergymen, seem to be restricted to purely professional work in a fashion that we do not dream of in London. Here it seems to be understood that a clergyman cannot go outside of his strictly professional work without doing wrong. He is outside of politics entirely; he is not expected to lecture much, not expected to concern himself with social questions, and not expected to concern himself much with education, justice, or temperance. To a Londoner this seems all wrong, but it is useless to question it. Any attempt to break through these lines results in unpleasantness. Clergymen are well paid, and kindly treated, but they are not expected to work for the good of their fellow-men, except in certain defined lines. In England the clergy of the Establishment are frequently justices of the peace. We of the Non-Conformist party are members of the School Board, Public Works, and so forth, and take a part in all public movements. The London School Board has a number of clergymen; I was the member for Marylebone for some years. I took the greatest interest in my work, and all who have looked into the question know what a perfect school system we have in London. Every

child in the city has to attend school or explain its absence. I believe even the Prince of Wales's children were called upon. I feel the want of such employment here to some extent, although I have not been idle by any means as pastor of the Brick Church; but it would not be liked, I am sure. You Americans are far more conservative than Englishmen, and we, who feel it in every-day life, do not always like it. I was asked to go to a great meeting on a public topic soon after I got here, and went to find that all I was expected to do was to open the meeting with a prayer and close it with a benediction. I was dumfounded."

There are probably few American ministers who would not take exception to every one of these generalizations. We suspect that there is, neither in England nor in America, anything like positive expectation on the part of the public, or on the part of his own congregation, that a minister's activity shall display itself in fields outside his professional work. We question much whether in either country a congregation has ever been dissatisfied with a minister on this score. There are and have been in London several eminent Dissenting ministers who have displayed no such activity—Mr. Spurgeon is one—without causing any apparent disappointment to their admirers. Is it not true that in both countries the matter is left to the minister's own temperament, and ambition, and intellectual needs? If he busies himself with politics or philanthropy, the congregation says, Well and good. If he confines himself to purely professional work, it also says, Well and good. In this country, ministers who have the health, the capacity, and the overmastering impulse to go outside their churches and occupy themselves with education, charities, and temperance abound everywhere. Every city of any size can show some. In New York there are many. We suspect that the churches of both the late Dr. Bellows and of Henry Ward Beecher have been rather disposed to think that their pastors did too much during the last twenty years of the very kind of work which Dr. Bevan complains that he cannot get at all. But it is a kind of work which neither in this country nor in England is forced on any man, either lay or clerical. Every professional man gets as much of it as he asks for—no more, but no less. If a minister goes to many public meetings without being invited to do more than pray and pronounce the benediction, he may be sure that it is because he has given no recognizable sign of desiring a more prominent part. The American demand for oratorical thunder and organizing activity is practically unlimited.

As regards clerical participation in politics, Dr. Bevan's remarks have a good deal of force. There is little question that in the large cities, and especially in this city, the caucus is an all but insurmountable barrier to anything like active participation in politics on the part of educated men of any calling. In the first place, the platform talk of a man who neither goes to caucus nor controls the daily press has comparatively little weight with the class who make up political conventions. It goes in at one ear and out at the other, and they privately ridicule him as a theorist or doctrinaire. In the second place, an honorable and educated man cannot participate in a New York caucus without exposing himself either to humiliating defeats, or to apparent participation in acts and practices

which are revolting to his moral sense. If he continues to attend it constantly without lowering his standard both of private and political integrity, he rapidly becomes an object of ridicule to the "workers," and, if he is worth much to the community, soon reaches the conclusion that his time can be far better employed in his study than at the primary. In England, where the caucus is not yet established, and the office-holders do no political work, volunteers of all classes are more necessary and more welcome in politics than here, and ministers may if they please be as active politically as they used to be in New England, and in some parts of it are still. In fact, it is of the utmost importance to every democratic community that its professed moralists should not be excluded from politics, but should, on the contrary, take an active part in them. Nothing but good can come of it if the machinery is such that it can be worked just as easily by the honest men as by the knaves.

THE VACCINATION QUESTION.

THE recent epidemic of smallpox has had the usual effect of calling public attention to the merits of vaccination, and of producing a large amount of discussion upon the subject. The parties to this discussion represent every possible shade of opinion. Some declare that vaccination has not only not diminished, but has actually increased, the virulence and fatality of smallpox, while it has been the means of spreading syphilis, scrofula, and other similar diseases. Others assert that it is an almost specific preventive of smallpox—that a person properly vaccinated is safe in a smallpox hospital filled with the worst form of cases, and that the operation is so simple and certain that it should be made compulsory and universal. The non-professional man is sometimes much puzzled to decide between these conflicting statements, and as to the reliability and true significance of the voluminous statistics which are produced on either side; and although in most cases he follows the majority, and has himself and his family vaccinated, or revaccinated, as the case may be, he nevertheless has some lurking doubts and fears as to the result, and as to whether the amount of protection obtained is worth the trouble and cost which it involves.

It seems worth while, therefore, to state briefly the opinions which prevail upon this subject among those physicians and statisticians who are generally recognized as scientific investigators, and as authorities in their respective departments. We must be guided by probabilities in this matter; and as we find that such physicians and statisticians as we have referred to are almost unanimous in their views upon certain points, and are only opposed in them by men who are not specially known as scientific men, but rather as popular agitators, the probabilities are largely in favor of the opinions which we summarize as follows:

Smallpox is a specific disease, produced by a special contagium which never arises spontaneously, but is always derived from a case of the disease. No combination of filth, overcrowding, bad food, temperature, moisture, etc., will produce smallpox in the absence of the specific contagium. Persons who have had the disease once rarely have it a second time, yet in violent epidemics the number of cases of second attacks may be as high as 6 per 1,000 of all cases, and 10 per cent. of these second attacks prove fatal. Persons of all ages and conditions of life seem to

be equally susceptible to the disease; but prior to the introduction of vaccination about 80 per cent. of deaths from smallpox occurred in children under 5 years of age. Smallpox, during the last century, caused about one-thirteenth of the total number of deaths, taking the statistics for long periods of years, and its epidemics swept over Europe at intervals varying from 5 to 10 years; that is, about as often as a fresh stock of susceptible material was produced by births.

Vaccination began at the commencement of the present century. At first it was supposed to be an absolute preventive against smallpox, and that if a person had the disease after vaccination, it was a proof that the operation had not been properly performed. It is now, however, well recognized that the protection produced by a perfect vaccination is not so thorough as that produced by an attack of smallpox, and that properly-vaccinated persons may not only be attacked by smallpox, but may die of it. Nor is the effect produced by vaccination a permanent one, its mean duration being usually estimated at from 9 to 10 years. Of 731 deaths in the Leipsic epidemic, there were 9 in persons under 10 years of age who had been vaccinated. Of 48 deaths in the Riverside Hospital, New York, 44 were unvaccinated, three were doubtful, and one had been vaccinated. In all countries where vaccination has been general, when an epidemic of smallpox occurs, the larger part of the cases are in vaccinated persons, the reason being that there are present a very much larger number of vaccinated than of unvaccinated persons. In such communities the greater number of deaths occur in persons over 25 years of age, instead of in children, as is the case in unvaccinated communities. Systematic revaccination renews the immunity for a term of years, and has a powerful influence in reducing the mortality among adults in communities where it is practised. This is conclusively shown by the statistics of the armies of the United States and of other countries.

Vaccination in some cases produces immediate bad results, but these are rare exceptions. It must be remembered that vaccination is usually performed in infancy, when disease and death are more frequent than at any other period of life, and we cannot expect that vaccinated infants will present any immunity from disease and death except so far as smallpox is concerned. It must not be concluded, therefore, that all cases of sickness and death following vaccination are caused by it; this is the old fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. But in a very few cases vaccination produces disease. During the year 1877 there were in Prussia 1,252,554 vaccinations, and 44 deaths followed in these cases. An official investigation showed that in 42 cases this was merely a coincidence; in 2 cases the death was really due to the vaccination. The English reports show that in 2,000,000 vaccinations death resulted from the operation in 64 cases.

The greatest danger from vaccination is from the use of impure virus, and especially from virus taken from persons affected with syphilis. The total number of cases in which the transmission of syphilis by vaccination has been reported is about 750, and this in more than 100,000,000 cases of vaccination during the last 80 years. This danger is now totally avoided by the use of bovine virus. The possibility that bovine virus may be the means of transmitting tubercle has been suggested, but as yet there is no known authentic case of such transmission, and the danger must be very small. The chief evil to be feared from the use of bovine virus is erysipelas, and this may be due either to impure virus or to the condition of the person operated upon. There is

a very considerable quantity of impure virus in the market at the present time, more especially in the form of what are termed patent vaccine-cones and vaccine-powder; and in this country there is no satisfactory supervision of the quality of the virus used, except perhaps in the city of Providence.

The remote effect of vaccination is to increase the mortality from diseases other than smallpox: the children whom it preserves furnish additional material for the ravages of scarlet fever, measles, etc. It prolongs life, but, taking long periods of years into account, it does not diminish the total mortality. Those who do not die of smallpox must, sooner or later, die of something else. We have examined carefully the statistics presented by the anti-vaccinationists, and especially those given in the works of Prof. A. Vogt, of Berne, but we have found them entirely unreliable. In some of the few cases in which the references to the original data are given, the figures are incorrectly quoted; in others the calculations of ratios do not give the results claimed. For example, on page 168 of his larger work, 'Für und wider die Kuhpockenimpfung,' etc., he gives the following table:

MORTALITY FROM SMALLPOX AT GENEVA DURING 150 YEARS (1580 TO 1760).

Age.	Mean population.	Mean number per annum from smallpox.	Proportion of deaths in 10,000 (as given by Vogt)	True proportion.
0-5 years	1,383	30.37	87.6	219.6
5-10 "	1,163	5.83	20.2	50.6
10-15 "	1,058	0.70	2.6	6.6

The fourth column shows Vogt's calculation of ratios, and the fifth shows the true ratios. It is impossible to have the slightest respect for an author who is either so ignorant or so mendacious as to assert that the ratios stated in the fourth column are correct; and yet Vogt is the statistician *par excellence* of the anti-vaccinationists.

It seems clear enough that vaccination has preserved and prolonged many lives, and prevented a vast amount of blindness, deafness, and other afflictions which smallpox is so apt to produce when it spares life; and also that the evils which result from it are so very small in comparison with the good it has produced that no one need hesitate to avail himself of the protection it affords. On the other hand, there is no immediate prospect that it will enable us to stamp out smallpox, nor is it by any means an absolute safeguard; and when it comes to the question of making vaccination compulsory, we have to take into consideration a number of other things besides the mere efficiency of the vaccination itself. We cannot undertake to discuss the merits of compulsory vaccination within the limits of this article, and would only suggest at present that it is far more necessary in this country to provide some means by which all persons can obtain thoroughly reliable, pure vaccine, and also for the prevention of the sale of impure virus, than it is to secure compulsory vaccination; and that it is inexpedient to demand the latter until the former has been satisfactorily provided for. It is the compulsion that has produced most of the controversy. No doubt if a law had been passed forbidding vaccination, a certain number of the people who now oppose it would have organized into a society, started a journal, and vaccinated themselves and their children once a year, or oftener if necessary, to prove their abhorrence of compulsion.

THE ORGANIZATION OF COLLEGE FACULTIES.

THE growth of some of the larger of our universities is beginning to give especial interest to a question which for some years past has been receiving the thoughtful attention of the university authorities in the Old World. The multiplication of branches taught on the one hand, and the tendency toward a concentration of individual energies to the prosecution of special studies on the other, give rise to some considerations of not a little importance. What ought to be the organization of a large academic faculty? Should it be divided into separate schools, each school having plenary jurisdiction over the students and the affairs of that school, or should it maintain its organization in its integrity? Ought all of the numerous questions coming up for decision to be referred to the whole body of instructors, or ought the faculty to be subdivided into groups, to each one of which alone the particular questions appropriate to that group should be referred? Is it wise to encourage the organization of separate schools analogous to the Sheffield and the Lawrence Scientific Schools, or, on the other hand, is it better to keep all the officers of instruction within the general jurisdiction of a single organization? The importance of the subject increases as the number of officers in a faculty multiplies; and consequently, in some of the universities of Germany, where the philosophical faculty numbers a hundred or more members, it has become one of the vital educational questions of the day. As we go to Italy for the study of art, and as we go to England for the study of constitutional government, so we go to Germany for the study of educational theories and methods. The subject having recently attracted so much attention in Germany, it may be well to present some of its most important features.

As early as 1832 the several questions involved were discussed by Robert von Mohl in the first edition of his 'Polizei-Wissenschaft.' The ground was taken that studies in science and studies in philosophy and philology are so radically different that, sooner or later, those in control of educational matters would come to see that the interests of education require the organization of separate faculties. The next impulse to the policy of division was given at Giessen in consequence of the prominence to which scientific studies were raised by Liebig. In 1835 the Ministry addressed a note of inquiry to the philosophical faculty of that university, asking the members to consider whether the cause of education would be enhanced by a division of that body into two or more schools. The question was carefully discussed, and was decided in the negative. But the University Senate took the opposite view, and, by a very small majority, decided in favor of a division into three schools. The Ministry, however, took no action on the subject. But in 1863 the same question was successfully revived in the very university in which the first word had been spoken in its behalf. The party advocating division carried the day; and from the inaugural address of Hugo von Mohl, a brother of the famous economist and the first dean of the new scientific faculty, we learn that the division was brought about in consequence of a movement in the faculty of medicine.

The policy of division, however, though entered upon with enthusiasm by the University of Tübingen, was not adopted by the other universities. The Austrian Government inquired of the philosophical faculty of Vienna whether a division would be advantageous. The proposition was rejected by a large majority. The university at Breslau also considered the ques-

tion with the utmost care: for two full years it was under discussion. The policy of division at one time was adopted, but when the details came to be decided upon there was so much difference of opinion that the majority was reduced to a minority, and the proposition was at last rejected. Other universities considered the question with the same result. Although in several of them a strong party in favor of separate organizations was developed, yet in no one of them was the advocacy of change strong enough to overthrow the established order of things. Nevertheless, when the new University of Strassburg came to be established, the advocates of division once more carried the day. Though it might not be wise to change radically an organization already established, it still seemed best to the Government in the founding of a new institution to recognize the force of the argument in favor of separate organizations. The new university, therefore, was given not only a philosophical faculty, but also a faculty of mathematics and the natural sciences.

The universities of Tübingen and Strassburg are the only ones in which a complete division into separate faculties has taken place. In four of the universities the question was decided by adopting what may be called a medium course. These were the universities of Munich, Würzburg, Bonn, and Leipsic. At Munich a plan was adopted by which the faculty was to maintain its integrity for the discussion and decision of all questions of general policy, while at the same time it should be divided into two sections for the purpose of administering affairs of more specific interest. One section has charge of all matters pertaining to philosophy, philology, and history, while the other devotes itself to the interests of studies in mathematics and the natural sciences. Each section is organized under the direction of a dean; and the senior of the two deans presides at the meetings of the general faculty. A similar method of organization prevails at Würzburg, except that one dean only is chosen, whose duty it is to preside not only over the whole faculty, but also over each of the two sections whenever they are called upon to act in their separate capacities. The dean is chosen alternately first from the one section and then from the other. At Bonn and at Leipsic the question of organization was settled in a somewhat different manner. As early as 1834 a number of embarrassing questions touching the privileges of certain departments of study led at Bonn to a careful consideration of the matter of faculty organization, and the differences finally resulted in a compromise which, from that day to this, has remained undisturbed by any modification. The faculty preserves its integrity as a whole for the transaction of all business of a general character. For the superintendence of the work in the several branches of study, however, it is divided into four sections, each one having its presiding officer. Of these sections, the first has charge of all matters coming under the head of philosophy; the second, those pertaining to philology; the third, to history and political science; and the fourth, to mathematics and the natural sciences. At Leipsic the division is the same, except that philosophy and philology are grouped into one section or school. It is worthy of note that this plan of organization, in the course of the forty-five years that have elapsed since its adoption, has been so successful in its workings that no official proposition for changing it has ever been made.

At the inauguration of Prof. Hofmann, not long since, as Rector of the University of Berlin, the subject of his address was "The Question of Dividing the Philosophical Faculty" (*Die Frage der Theilung der philosophischen Facul-*

tät). The several phases of the subject were considered at length. The author had sent letters of inquiry to members of nearly or quite all the faculties of the German universities, the replies to which are published as an appendix to the second edition of his address. They are of very considerable general interest; but the matter of especial importance for our present purpose is the fact that the whole tone of the correspondence lends itself to the advocacy of the method of organization that originated at Bonn. Prof. Hofmann recognizes this drift of what may be called university opinion, and not only falls into the current, but advocates the popular doctrine with characteristic energy and eloquence. He is opposed to the division of the corps of instructors into distinct faculties, for the reason that such a division tends inevitably to intellectual narrowness and bigotry. The chief part of his argument may be described as an elaboration of the thought so well expressed by Goethe in his well-known line:

"Im engen Kreise verengert sich der Sinn."

But while the author deplores the policy of complete division and separation, he fully recognizes the imperative necessity of some change. He insists that it is impossible for a large faculty sitting as a whole to consider adequately and wisely the necessities of individual branches of study. In seeking for a solution which shall at the same time promise the greatest amount of good and threaten the least amount of evil, he arrives at the conclusion that the middle course is the one which ought to be adopted. The integrity of the faculty ought to be maintained for the purposes of general legislation, while the more immediate supervision of the several branches or groups of study should be entrusted to subordinate sections or schools. This method, moreover, has the advocacy of nearly fifty years of most successful experience.

THE FRENCH PANIC.—THE NEW CABINET.

PARIS, February 16, 1882.

WE are going through an extraordinary financial crisis. It has this peculiarity, that it is almost a social crisis; at least, it affects a great part of what is called society—the most frivolous part: the portion of society which is composed of the devotees of chance, which is seen at the races, in the best clubs—the *fast* people. It has also this character, that it affects the women as well as the men, as some ladies had been seized by the mania of the Bourse speculations. Pailleton, the author of the "*Monde où l'on s'ennuie*," and who depicts the follies of the present day, will have a fine subject if he undertakes to touch this ground. I will not, even by allusion, speak of some of the heroines, who are known to all Paris: it is enough to know that there never have been so many fine collars of pearls and diamonds pawned or sold; that some of the greatest hôtels are to let; that some persons who were the leaders of fashion and who were a part of "all Paris" have ceased to make their appearance; that some of the boxes at the opera are empty, or filled by unknown faces. The women had gone on in this line with their usual want of prudence and their wonted passion; they are the fair victims of the famous "*Union Générale*." As for the men, they are legion—ignorant clubmen who thought that it was as easy to play at the Bourse as at the card-table; gentlemen who expected to retrieve their fortunes, credulous people who really believed that the new bank could make gold out of nothing.

How can the best heads resist the emotions of the gentleman (he is well known in Paris) who went through these successive stages of fortune?

I cite this case only because I happen to have very trustworthy information on the subject. This gentleman was leading a quiet, easy, lazy life, with his paternal fortune of about 600,000 francs placed in five-per-cent. stocks. The Union was founded; he saw in the board of directors some of the best names of France—names which had hitherto been spotless. He took 5,000 shares, on which he paid one-fourth, which was called. This absorbed 575,000—that is to say, his whole fortune. The shares rose, rose, first gradually, then feverishly, under the excitement of a wild speculation. The "Jews" sold; the Union bought its own shares; the shares rose to 3,000 francs. My gentleman was then able to realize 15,000,000 of francs. All his friends urged him to do so. No; the shares would rise higher; he had faith in the enterprise and its leaders. They rose to 3,500 francs, when suddenly the panic came; the Union had bought so many of its own shares that all its resources were gone. Its enemies were advised of it; they sold and sold, and literally threw out of the window, shares which the Union could no longer buy. In a single day the shares fell by the thousand francs. The unfortunate millionaire saw his millions dwindle under him, and in the course of a week he was ruined. He never sold; the crisis was so sudden that he had no time for reflection, and his stupid faith only vanished when everything had vanished. And what is his position now? The syndics of the failure will be obliged to realize the assets, and to make a call for the three-fourths of the shares still unpaid and still subject to call. They will demand from him alone the sum of 2,175,000 francs, which he is absolutely incapable of paying. What will he do? Blow out his brains, like the nineteen men who have already done so since the crisis? A paper keeps the table of mortality of the Union: he would make the twentieth.

Alas! this is one case among hundreds and thousands. Here is a man who, in the course of a few months, rose from ease to great wealth, and sank from this artificial wealth to absolute and irremediable misery. And the crisis is not over; the Union was the drop which made the overflow. It produced a very severe crisis at the Bourse, in the focus of speculation. What must happen now? Within a few years a large number of banks of credit and deposit have sprung up everywhere; the eye is met at every corner by magnificent houses, which are the new banks; some are real palaces. These establishments are really no banks at all, in the old sense of the word; they made their profits out of the creation of shares, sold at a premium. These shares represented all sorts of new affairs—mines, railways, etc.—some real, some half-real, some imaginary. The general impetus given to business for a number of years favored this movement; people were talking in hundreds of millions; it seemed as if capital were a thing which was created by spontaneous generation, not by economy and by work. Now this state of things is reversed; universal confidence has been replaced by universal fear. It would be impossible to float new shares, to attract the money of the public to any new enterprise.

What will become of these new banks of credit? Such as have received deposits from the public will see all their deposits withdrawn, either slowly or rapidly, according to the degree of confidence which they inspire; their profits will become reduced to nothing, and their general expenses, which are enormous, will remain the same. It is impossible that all of them should withstand the pressure of these adverse circumstances. We are, therefore, likely to see a bank crisis coming after the present Bourse crisis. The third act of these natural evolutions is generally a crisis in real estate. During the

last few years Paris has built for itself new quarters; the price of land has increased enormously. Many men with borrowed money, many companies formed with the money of the public, have built gigantic houses, great streets lined with modern palaces. The rents asked for the apartments in these new houses are very large, as they must cover the interest and the sinking fund of an extravagantly large capital. At the present moment there is a great number of these apartments still unoccupied. The proprietors counted upon the continuation of the extraordinary prosperity which the country has enjoyed during a few years; but a crisis at the Bourse, a crisis of the banks, will soon force them to reduce the price of rents. Many of the new building-companies will become bankrupt, and there will be a depreciation of the value of real estate in Paris in a year or two. These grave events have completely thrown politics into the shade. Their consequences come home almost everywhere; the financial "Krach" has produced much more effect than the political "Krach." Gambetta has vanished almost out of people's minds; he has gone south, as if he wished himself to be forgotten, at least for a little while.

How much philosophy there is in the exhibition of caricatures in the kiosks of the boulevard. I remember that after the amnesty, when all the Communists and exiles came back, the Gambettists were very bitter against the author of the *Lanterne*, Rochefort, as if they feared his influence over the people of Paris. One of Gambetta's organs published a letter written by Rochefort to M. Thiers, when Rochefort was in prison at Versailles and appeared before a council of war. A violent quarrel broke out on account of this letter. Rochefort denied its authenticity; said that it was a mere draft of a letter which was taken from him by his lawyer, but which was not to be delivered to M. Thiers. The Gambettist papers insisted that Rochefort had intended to beg M. Thiers to pardon him. In one of the caricatures of the time Gambetta was seen, in the dress of *Hamlet*, holding in his hand the head of Rochefort, looking, as usual, very worn and ghastly. "Alas! poor Yorick!" said Gambetta. My eyes fell, a few days ago, on a paper in a kiosk. There was now Rochefort, with a plume in his hat, and a flowing mantle; he had in his hand the head of Gambetta, with one eye dilated and almost falling out, the other eye gone—"Alas! poor Yorick!" Such is the mutability of history. There is no doubt that Rochefort made a terrible war on Gambetta and the school of the Opportunists; he was unsparing, ferocious, like a red Indian. Gambetta was attacked with more art and apparent moderation by Jules Simon, his old adversary at Bordeaux. Jules Simon took, for this object, the editorship of the *Gaulois* (the paper which is publishing the new novel of Zola, '*Pot-Bouille*'), and every day he wrote an article against Gambetta. These articles were, in a literary sense, very curious. Their form was quite new; they were not dry and dogmatic; they assumed the tone of an easy conversation at the fireside. Some of them had almost the brilliancy of *Pré-vost-Paradol*.

Still, the opposition of Rochefort and of Jules Simon would have been of little avail against Gambetta, if the latter had not turned against himself the Chamber of Deputies. He offended the Chamber in its dignity and in its interests. By attacking the *scrutin d'arrondissement*, he offered the Chamber an insult which it would not forgive. He said one day, in a moment of anger, that the Chamber was composed of "*sous-vétérinaires*" (assistant horse-doctors), meaning that the *scrutin d'arrondissement* had brought to the surface only mediocre men, under-educated, ob-

secure, with no general views. It is quite true that the Chamber is chiefly composed of the politicians of the provinces, who have most of them their fortune to make, and only four years to make it in. But if under a monarchy it is necessary to put up with a bad king, it is necessary under the Republic to bear with a bad Assembly. Gambetta could not dispense with this Assembly, and he showed too soon his contempt for it; he incurred its ill-will instead of ruling it and conducting it. He thought himself too strong, too indispensable; the Chamber soon proved to him that the instinct of self-preservation was much stronger than the devotion and admiration which the Republicans had professed for Gambetta during the elections.

The new Cabinet has inherited a very delicate situation. Its strength is purely negative: it will live by the fear which the *scrutin de liste* has created in the ranks of the majority; it will live by the fear of a possible return of Gambetta, by the alarm which his active foreign policy has created in the community. If there is a strong sentiment in the nation, it is the dread of any complication outside. The Freycinet Cabinet has straightway turned the Egyptian Question into a European question: it will not send a soldier or a ship to Alexandria. We continue with England the financial *condominium*, but the Controllers have virtually ceased to be the masters of Egypt. Arabi Bey and the National party will have it all their own way. France falls back and says to Europe: "Egypt is not on my frontier; it is not Tunis. I will remain in Tunis, but do as you please in Egypt; you will have my good offices, but nothing more."

THE FIRST DEBATES OF THE SESSION.

LONDON, February 23.

PARLIAMENT had been sitting for nearly a fortnight before the debate on the Queen's Speech, which, as you know, is delivered at the opening of each session, could be brought to a close. In better and less troubled days it was generally despatched in a single evening; but we have changed all that, and now make it an occasion for attacks on the vulnerable points of ministerial policy and demonstrations against all the rest. This year, like last year, Ireland has been the main theme of discussion. Those who thought that the Land Act of last year had procured for England and Scotland a respite from Irish questions for some time to come, and that we should be left free to attend to domestic legislation, are already beginning to realize their mistake. Ireland is still with us and upon us, an ever-pressing difficulty. Irish members and subjects are likely to go on absorbing a large part of the time of the country and its Ministers. As regards its Irish policy the Government has been subjected to a cross-fire. The Parnellite or Nationalist party complain bitterly of the fact that 512 persons, arrested on suspicion under the act of last session which suspended *habeas corpus*, are now lying in various Irish jails, and threaten that their continued detention will only more inflame the country. While not venturing openly to justify the outrages on private individuals, chiefly farmers who have paid their rent or taken farms from which others have been evicted, they represent these lawless acts as the natural consequence of the irritation produced by the severe action of the Government, and especially of the popular distrust in the good intentions of those who have imprisoned such leaders as Mr. Parnell and Mr. Dillon. So far from professing gratitude for the Land Act, they declare it to be a wholly inadequate remedy; insist on the hardships of tenants already in arrears whom the

landlords may evict. And behind all, they not only repeat the old demand for a separate Irish Parliament, but intimate that even the separate Parliament may not be a sufficient concession, and that, in the long run, nothing less than absolute independence will solve the problem. Such language is, of course, seized on and used by the Tories, who attack the Government from the opposite point of view. According to them, the mistake of the Government has been, not severity, but leniency—misplaced leniency in the first instance, which permitted the land agitation to rise to proportions so formidable that even the recent severities have not availed to stop it. "If *habeas corpus* had been suspended earlier," they say, "if the Land League had not been encouraged by the language which members of the Government employed, our present troubles might have been avoided, and such a revolutionary measure as the Land Act would not even have appeared to be needed."

In condemning the Land Act itself they add two new arguments against it, both of which have produced some effect on public opinion, at least in the upper classes. One is drawn from its working. The judges of the Land Court and assistant commissioners working under them are accused of having dealt harshly with the landlords, of having gone quite too far in reducing rents—of having, in fact, behaved rather as political partisans than as judges. And the other is founded on the fact that, despite the Land Act, the country remains disturbed. "The only ground, say they, 'on which you obtained from Parliament this extraordinary change in the law—this measure which unsettled the rights of property and violated plain principles of political economy—was your declaration that nothing less could satisfy the Irish people, your promise that it would act as a sedative under whose genial action sedition and murder would decline and vanish. No such effects have followed. Things are as bad as they were before. You have to keep over five hundred people in jail. Your military and police garrison in Ireland is larger than ever. You have incensed and plundered the upper classes without satisfying the lower. We have sacrificed our brother landowners in Ireland, we have abandoned our cherished principles of legislation, and all in vain. Life and property are just as insecure; the cry for separation becomes louder; you have exhausted your prescriptions, and have no further remedy left." These reproaches produce some impression, and would produce a much deeper one if the Tory leaders had any alternative policy to suggest. But this they neither have now nor have had at any time during the last few years. They say, of course, that it is not their business to do so; that the duty of an Opposition is merely to criticise. Still, as an Opposition is always a government *in posse*, it becomes material to know what the present Opposition would do if it were placed in power; and this they have hitherto not indicated, except by general declarations that the unity of the Empire and the sanctity of property must be upheld.

Whether they would even adhere to the Land Act of last session seems doubtful after the last move which the Conservative leaders have made. The Land Act has now been in operation since last October. A great army of assistant commissioners have been appointed and set to work in hearing the applications of tenants for a reduction of rents—applications based usually on the allegation that they, and not the landlords, have improved the land. In a large majority of cases the rents have in fact been reduced, and ample evidence has been produced that in many cases landlords had screwed up the rents to a point at which the tenant could barely exist. So far, the Act has been justified, and the con-

duct of the commissioners approved, by those who passed it. But the landlords of course look on the result with far different eyes. They had already suffered seriously in pocket by the default of many tenants to pay rent during the last two or three bad seasons. They now see their income permanently cut down by the reductions which the commissioners are carrying out, while not only the cost of living remains the same, but the charges payable out of their lessened incomes, such as the interest on mortgages, or annuities to brothers or sisters, have not been proportionately reduced, and press very heavily on them. There has been a great deal of positive distress among the minor landlords, which furnishes some palliation for the impatience and violence with which the Land Act and those connected with it have been assailed. Some have urged that compensation should be made from the public treasury to those whose rents are reduced; but as this would involve the absurdity of treating best those who have raised their rents highest, it is felt to be impracticable. Another suggestion is to diminish the interest on mortgages and other similar charges in proportion; but the practical difficulty of doing this so as to be fair to everybody would be immense, and people recoil from so great an interference with ordinary contracts as the reduction of interest on a mortgage loan.

In this state of general discontent and irritation, the Irish landlords, who are, with few exceptions, strong Conservatives, moved in the House of Lords for a committee to inquire into the working of the Irish Land Act. The Government opposed the proposition, declaring not only that it was ridiculous to pull up the young plant before it had begun to strike root, but also that such an inquiry could not fail to alarm the minds of the Irish tenants, and still further unsettle the country. However, the motion was supported by the Conservative leaders, who always command a large majority in the House of Peers, and carried easily after one night's debate. When it had been carried, people began to perceive what serious consequences it might have. The House of Lords is, of course, quite powerless to reverse any legislative action of the House of Commons—so powerless that it did not even venture last year to reject the Land Bill, which it heartily detested. All it could do in this case would be to inquire—that is, to appoint some of its number to call witnesses from Ireland, landlords and tenants, commissioners and assistant commissioners, question them, and report the results of the evidence it had taken, with such suggestions as it pleased to add. No change in the law, or in the action of the Executive, need follow. But the committee would have virtually erected itself into a sort of court of appeal from the Land Commission, would have interrupted its work by summoning its officers as witnesses to London, would have created a feeling that the commissioners were liable to be interfered with, would have made the tenants think they held their lands and paid these lower rents under the old insecurity. In fact, the objections to such an inquiry as the House of Lords had decided on were recognized by moderate men of both parties to be so grave that it was thought the Lords would perhaps repent and recede.

They were not allowed much time for repentance. Their resolution was passed on Friday night, and on Monday Mr. Gladstone gave notice that he would move a resolution in the House of Commons disapproving of any such inquiry at present, as calculated to increase the difficulties of governing Ireland. Such a slap in the face by one House to the other, although not quite without precedent, is rare in modern times, and has, of course, intensified the already prevailing excite-

ment. The House of Commons has a strong corporate spirit which makes it rather enjoy a tussle with the Lords, and the conduct of the latter is generally thought unwise, so that the Ministry may count pretty confidently on the support of their followers. But people ask whether it would not have been better to defeat the committee in some quieter way: whether obstacles could not have been interposed to its sittings, or to its getting the assistant commissioners to come over from Ireland as witnesses; whether, when a little time had elapsed, the project would not have been suffered to drop by its own promoters. "Is not this," they say, "another instance of Mr. Gladstone's impetuosity, which goes too quick, if not too straight, to his mark?" Of course he may be able to show that the state of Ireland is so delicate that an immediate demonstration against the evident wish of the Peers to reverse the policy of the Land Commission is necessary. But in any case the expenditure of time which the discussion of his resolution will involve, must add to the perplexities of the Government. They have kept back all their important bills until the new rules for the procedure of the House of Commons shall have been passed. The first of these rules, that providing a means of putting an end to a debate similar to your "previous question," has been just introduced. It meets with great opposition, and will be discussed for several nights. Other rules sure to provoke long debates follow. The Easter vacation may arrive before these rules have been disposed of, and they will not be finished even then if a great debate on the Irish land question is interposed. Now, the one thing by which the Ministry must preserve, or regain, its credit is the passing of some substantially useful measures. All that goes wrong is charged on the Ministry in power; excuses, however just, are unheeded, results alone impress the public mind. If, therefore, the present Government fails to carry through a good part, at any rate, of the reforms which it promised, that reaction which is always more or less in progress against the Executive will advance apace, and the next general election, reducing the Liberal majority, will leave the two English parties equally balanced, and make the Parnellites, whose numbers a general election would doubtless swell, masters of the situation. This is a prospect that might be expected to mollify the minds of English Tories and Liberals, and dispose them to arrange their differences. But party feeling is far too bitter now for that, nor are there any signs that its bitterness will lessen. Y.

THE CHANGE OF MINISTRY IN EGYPT.

ALEXANDRIA, February 14.

THE fall of Sherif Pasha's Ministry will have been known by telegram long before this letter appears, but the telegraph never proves its insufficiency as a means of communication more remarkably than when it endeavors to convey Egyptian news. In the first place, it tells either too much or too little. In the second place, it necessarily omits all the qualifying circumstances and subtle modifications which are the main staple of Oriental politics. In the third place, the telegraph is usually resorted to while the news is yet only half-fledged, and has not had time to prove that it is no news at all. During the late political crisis nothing could contrast more signally than the complacent temper and undisturbed repose of the European population in Egypt—that is, both in Cairo and Alexandria—and the alarm of readers of English newspapers in England. Though, however, there never was any cause for a moment's real disquietude for the safety of the European settlers in this country, the late events have such an im-

portant bearing on the state and near future of Egyptian politics, that it is well worth while examining them with some care, and describing the condition of European opinion here in respect of them.

It will be remembered that Sherif Pasha's Ministry, which has just fallen, was the creature of the military *émeute* which took place last September. It was supposed to be the chosen instrument of the military leader, Arabi Bey, and his friends, and to express their dislike to Riaz Pasha, as representing preëminently the political intervention of France and England. I mentioned in a former letter that it was expected that the session of the Assembly of Notables would result in a conflict of opinion regarding the financial administration. This Assembly has been somewhat magnified in the English papers, and elsewhere, into a popular representative Legislature, and Sir Charles Dilke, not to say the authors of the Queen's speech, showed some disposition to pat Egypt on the back as making its first playful sallies in the direction of popular government. Indeed, the pretentious name, "the National Party," has, like other misleading political titles in other countries, done much to foster a wholly ungrounded belief that party organization in Egypt has reached something more than the most embryonic, not to say the most microscopic, of forms.

The fact is that the elections to the Chamber of Notables were conducted in the most high-handed and superficial of methods, the electors caring little and knowing less about the matter, and the elected, as likely to incur considerable inconvenience from their forced residence in Cairo, being therefore the reverse of solicitous about the matter. I am told on good authority that a very small proportion of the House, of something less than a hundred members, can either read or write—though, of course, this incapacity means less in an Eastern than it would in a Western country. Nevertheless, this body undoubtedly got to work in a business-like sort of way, and, after complimentary and ceremonious overtures on the part of the Khedive, they addressed themselves to the problem of their own permanent constitution and powers. In this way two constitutional factors were brought into opposition: the one, that of this newly constituted body, with its powers and position yet undefined; the other, that of the executive government, led by Sherif Pasha, and weighted by its relationship to what is known as the European Control.

This Control is exercised by French and English representatives, according to the terms of the Decree of November 15, 1879. The Controllers-General "have in financial matters the most complete powers of investigation into all the public services." They "have the rank of Ministers at the Council, and a seat and consultative voice there." The Minister of Finance is bound to "furnish the Control every week with a detailed statement of all receipts and expenditure." This being so, Sherif Pasha, with every desire to gratify those who are adverse to European interference—that is, the strictly limited, but very noisy, number of persons known as the National party—had his hands tied, and could do no more than concede to the new Assembly such powers as could by no possibility interfere with the Control as guaranteed by the Decree of 1879. However, Sherif Pasha and his Council and Ministers did their best, and on a joint committee being appointed to discover terms of arrangement, finally offered as his ultimatum the following concession: Ministers were to be jointly and severally responsible to the Assembly for all acts which might infringe on its rights. The Assembly was to be at liberty to discuss and vote all laws submitted by the

Ministry, and to express an opinion on the Budget. No new tax, direct or indirect, could be established in Egypt without having been voted by the Assembly. "Neither Tribute, Public Debt, nor any charges on the country arising out of the Law of Liquidation or any international contract, were to be discussed." The issue was taken on the clause excluding the Assembly from the abstract right to plenary financial interference, and Sherif Pasha resigned.

A new Ministry was immediately formed, and it might be supposed that it entered upon its work prepared to make all the concessions to the Assembly which Sherif Pasha resisted. But, so far as any light is thrown on the situation at present, it does not seem that the terms of the new Constitution will threaten the guarantees for the Public Debt. In estimating the constitutional and political relevancy of this crisis, it will be a great mistake to make a free use of the analogies supplied by more advanced constitutional countries in the West. It is believed here, among persons well able to form an opinion, that little more is meant by the change of Ministry than a desire on the part of the incoming Government to take the place of the outgoing, and a successful raid accomplished in pursuit of that desire. The new Ministry and the leaders of the Assembly, in their public utterances, have striven with each other to manifest their respect for the financial obligations of the state. In fact, it is creditable to Sherif Pasha that he honestly adhered to the only admissible programme, and he is the unfortunate victim of what seems to be little better than a vulgar personal conspiracy.

The general movement, however, has called out the expression of various opinions on the part of the different representatives of European countries in this city, and also in Europe. It is generally felt that the change is a manifestation of hostility to the Anglo-French Protectorate of Egypt. The Italian organs here, and the Italian Government at home, somewhat rejoice in this. The French colony here have little cause for affection for Sherif Pasha, though its members are careful as to how they express themselves in view of the susceptibilities which are aroused in connection with French aggression in North Africa. The English public here and its organ, the *Egyptian Gazette*, seem quite prepared for the obtrusion of any amount of English influence, and regard the loyal support of the Control as the first duty of the new Ministry. But this policy seems hardly to be favored by the English Government at home, if Sir Charles Dilke, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, is its adequate exponent. He, in a recent speech, justly imputes the creation of the Control to Lord Salisbury and other Conservative adversaries. He regards the growth of what he fondly believes to be popular institutions as likely to hasten the time when Egypt can stand alone, and he looks with hopefulness on England's being able to withdraw from Egypt all intervention beyond what is needed for the absolute security of the route to India.

For my own part I do not believe in there being any National party in the sense which this expression carries to the Western mind. But I believe that the happy use of this form of speech, and the opportunity which the military party, led by Arabi Bey, has to do significant and lasting acts in the name of such a party, however fictitious, may possibly operate as a bulwark against a recurrence to merely despotic institutions. Sometimes a bare accidental anticipation of a great idea, though premature, becomes a substitute and real preparation for the establishment of the idea as a fact. The vision becomes true: the dream of freedom and of greatness makes the nation free and

great. In the present case, the cloud on the horizon, which, already much larger than a man's hand, threatens abundance of rain (a reminiscence which, by the way, the unprecedented downpour this year at Alexandria makes especially congenial), is the usurped military power which really controls the civil Government. If the new Assembly succeeds in vanquishing this, the reign of constitutional government is really begun. If it succumbs before it, or acts only as its tool, the miserable tale of a régime of military nominees will be reenacted as in Rome of old, and must sooner or later compel active European interference. A.

Correspondence.

THE AGNOSTIC'S RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your apparent inclination (*cf.* editorial on "Agnostic Worship" in *Nation* of Feb. 23) to limit religion to recognition and worship of a personal Deity, as well as your correspondent's ("Agnostic") distinction between religion and ethical culture (*Nation* of March 2) raise the general question of the meaning of religion. Sakya Mouni is said to have defined religion as "the perfect agreement of the will with the conscience"; and it is generally recognized that the philosophical basis of the Buddhist religion is agnostic. John Stuart Mill said:

"The essence of religion is the strong and earnest direction of the emotions and desires toward an ideal object, recognized as of the highest excellence, and as rightfully paramount over all selfish objects of desire. This condition is fulfilled by the Religion of Humanity in as eminent a degree, and in as high a sense, as by the supernatural religions, even in their best manifestations, and far more so than in their other."

The late Chauncey Wright, to whom the highest honor has been accorded by philosophical students for fairness and penetration of judgment, gave the following definitions of religion:

"Religion (subjective) means a man's devotion—the complete assent and concentration of his will—to any object which he acknowledges to have a right to his entire service, and supreme control over his life. Religion (objective) means the object or objects whose claims to this supremacy are acknowledged. An irreligious man is, then, first, one who acknowledges no supreme end or objects; or, secondly, one who, though he acknowledge, does not habitually submit his will to such a power" (*Letters of Chauncey Wright*, ed. by J. B. Thayer).

Dr. G. Stanley Hall, in the January *Princeton Review*, without essaying any complete definition, gives an admirable statement of what is, to our mind, the common and essential as opposed to the variable and secondary features of religion, in the view of it as "the popular culture of the highest ideal as opposed to material utility, which dominates so many of our intellectual interests, by reconformity of life to it. It may be formulated as unity with nature, as the readjustment of conduct to conscience, as restored harmony with self, reunion with God, newly awakened love for Jesus, fresh insight into his mind as new impulse to do his will. *The common element is obvious.*" (The italics are ours.)

Is it, then, impossible that men, though agnostic as to the ultimate nature of things, may agree as to the binding character of the moral law and give an absolute loyalty to the ideal for life and society which it enjoins, and, in obedience to such convictions and purposes, form what may properly be called a religious society? Because Christianity has formulated religion in one way—viz., as involving a relation between

man and a personal Deity—is it impossible that it should now be formulated in some other, more consistent with the intellectual temper of the age, and yet be as truly religion? W. M. S.

NEW YORK CITY, March 4, 1882.

[We print our correspondent's letter, while denying that we have said anything to call for it. We have said nothing showing an inclination "to limit religion to recognition and worship of a personal Deity." We have not discussed the question—What is religion?—at all. What we have been discussing is Agnostic prayer. We have maintained that prayer is a petition addressed to a power which can grant or deny it; that there is in the Agnostic system no such power; and that, therefore, Agnostic prayer, like Mr. Miln's, is either an imitation or reminiscence of the old worship, or simple ejaculation describing a sensation felt at the moment of utterance—such as, "Oh! for a little rest," or, "If it would only stop raining!" There doubtless may be a "religious society," or a society "for ethical culture," without such prayer or ejaculation, but on this point we have nothing to say.—ED. NATION.]

PARTIAL PAYMENT OF FIRE INSURANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of February 9 you suggest the possibility of introducing in this country the plan in use by French fire-insurance companies of paying no insurance upon the house in which a fire originates. It seems to me that a compromise between this and the usual plan would act almost as powerfully—one may say practically quite as powerfully—as an incentive to care on the part of the proprietors, while sacrificing far less of the benefits of fire insurance than does the French plan. If the company paid only half the loss sustained on the premises in which the fire originated, the proprietor would feel hardly, if at all, less anxious to adopt all necessary precautions than if the loss would be total; and probably even the deduction of one-fourth of the amount of loss would be quite sufficient to serve the purpose. Of course, a very grave objection to the French rule is, that it goes a great way to destroy the security which is the cardinal object of insurance; a compromise such as has been suggested above might reduce this objection to a minimum, while effecting almost as fully the purpose for which the rule is designed.

Yours, very respectfully,

F.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 28, 1882.

INSURANCE OF ANIMALS AGAINST ACCIDENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The insurance of animals against accident is a regular business in our times. I am not enough of an antiquarian to know whether there is any recorded instance of the practice older than that mentioned in the following instrument, now in my possession (the Norwich mentioned in the agreement is in Connecticut).

Very faithfully yours,

EDWARD S. HOLDEN.

WASHECHU OBSERVATORY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, March 2, 1882.

"This agreement or Covenant made & Concluded This first Day of June 1790 Between Doctor Lemuel Buswell of Norwich on the one part & Ph. Holden of sd Norwich on the other part Witnesseth—That the sd Buswell on his

part hath This Day Delivered to the sd Holden Two three year old Cows of a midling size & Bigness without Calves to be sd Holdens proper Estate and he sd Buswell Doth hereby—Warrent Their Lives against Lightning—and that only for the Space of six years from the above Date —Said Holden on his part Doth promise Bind and oblige him Self and heirs to Deliver to the said Buswell four Cows not Less then three years old nor more then Seven yer old of a midling Size and bigness to be sd Buswells proper Estate. Said four Cows to be Delivered to Said Buswell or heirs at the End of Six years from the above Date and to be without Calves—and for the True performance here of We have hereunto Interchangably Set our hand ye Day & year above Written.

"PHINEHAS HOLDEN

"LEMUEL BUSWELL

"Signed & Delivered
In Presence of us
"JONATHAN SMITH
"ANNE BUSWELL."

THE PENSION ARREARS ACT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following facts, in a somewhat different form, have already been brought to the notice of two members of Congress; but I have thought it advisable to lay them also before the public in the columns of a paper which has never yet shrunk from the disagreeable task of exposing fraud in all its forms. It is certainly the duty of every right-minded citizen to do all in his power to prevent the consummation of this stupendous raid upon the national treasury, the prospect of which is serious enough to fill every mind with alarm. Writing from a village of barely 150 houses, the number of facts which I present must of necessity be small, but I am confident that if the same inquiry were extended to other places, the results would be the same. Moreover, it does not need many facts to prove what might easily be reasoned out *a priori*.

There are three families in this town whose claims upon the Government purse admit of no dispute. One of the soldiers representing these families was killed in battle, a second died at Andersonville, and a third was severely wounded and disabled. To none of these families has the Arrears of Pensions Act been of the least benefit, for the simple reason that they experienced no delay in securing their pensions. Their claims being admitted from the first, and promptly granted, there was no "back pay" to call for when the act was passed. It is safe to say that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the same is true of all those families who have rendered unquestioned service to their country, and whose members yielded up their lives and health in its defence.

I come now to a class of cases where the Pension Arrears Act was of benefit; and what are they? A person returns from the war, and after a few years dies of consumption; another discovers on his return home that he is subject to epileptic fits; a third comes back minus two or three fingers, which he had lost while cleaning his gun. In all these cases there was of course considerable delay, partly for the reason that the claims were not immediately pressed. Indeed, in most cases of this kind it will be found that it was the pension agent himself who took the initiative in proffering his services. Then there was the difficulty of proof, which in some of them was by no means small. It is a significant fact that one of them was considered too desperate to attempt seriously until the Pension Arrears Act itself, with the large sum involved, made all obstacles seem light. Now, whatever delay there was in all these cases was owing to the uncertain character of the claims themselves, the one being proportionate to and a direct index of the other. The Pension Arrears Act ignored this fact, and placed both doubtful and valid claims upon the same footing. It

needs no argument to show the great difference between the services rendered in the two classes of cases, and yet the reward was in the end the same; with the odds even in favor of the latter, because the money came all at once. The delay was not felt by the claimants themselves to be an injustice. They were abundantly satisfied with what they had secured, and the arrears of pension came to them in the shape of an unexpected boon.

I have a single case that may at first sight seem an exception to the above. It is that of a person whose son died, or was killed, in the war. Here, certainly, any delay was unjust. But let us see. The father was one of the class of poor whites common enough in New England, who brought up his children with as little trouble as possible, and got rid of them at an early age. The son in question had not been under his father's roof for twelve or fifteen years, had moved to a distant part of the country, and it was only by chance that the father learned of his death. The mere fact that he was his father entitled him to a pension, although what difference it made to him whether his son was alive or dead would puzzle any one to say. It is one of the many cases in which the spirit of the law was sacrificed to the letter; in which the suffering was as remote as the connection of interest.

I now come to the third and last class of cases, the direct product of the Act itself. The passing of that Act was like the sowing of the dragon's teeth. An army of applicants has sprung suddenly into existence, demanding a sum of money large enough to form the nucleus of a new national debt. Of this army this community furnishes four, which, considering it includes all the remaining soldiers but one or two, is doing pretty well. Three of these have absolutely no claim whatever. None of them can show a wound or even an "injury to health"; and in one case at least the connection with the army was decidedly remote. None of them ever thought of applying for a pension until the Act was passed, when the success of previous applicants and the large sum at stake emboldened them to make the attempt.

The fourth case deserves a special mention. It is that of a person eighty years old. How he ever got into the army is a mystery. He claimed to have been hit by a shell, but, as his bodily vigor remained undiminished up to the last year or two of his life, the damage could not have been very great. His mental powers somewhat failed him of late years, so that he had forgotten even the officers of his own regiment. The obliging agent opened the book and read out the list of names, to which he willingly assented. He died lately, of sheer old age, but his heirs, I believe, hope to "realize."

Nor have the large sums of money paid out proved in all cases an unmixed good. A single instance will suffice. One of the persons referred to above received \$1,700 in a lump. What was the result? Six months of idleness, at the end of which all the money was spent, with almost nothing to show for it. Nor can anything better be promised in case the present applicants are successful. Such large sums of money, for which so little service has been rendered, cannot fail to exert a demoralizing effect upon the recipients. Originating, then, in a false conception, intended to remedy an injustice where none existed, the Pension Arrears Act has worked nothing but mischief from the start; but what, ever effect it has produced up to the present time sinks into insignificance compared with the evil which it threatens to accomplish. If some of the claims already granted have a doubtful ring, what shall we say of those which the Act itself has created? If delay is indicative of more or less fraud (and all the facts mentioned

above confirm it), then, in the face of the seventeen years that have rolled by since the war, the great majority of the 300,000 to 400,000 claims now pending stand condemned. The more we study the evidence before us, the more the conviction deepens that we stand upon the eve of one of the greatest swindles the country has ever witnessed; and for this state of things the Pension Arrears Act is alone responsible. No half-way measures will remedy the evil. To post the names of the applicants in a conspicuous place would have but little deterrent effect, nor will it be safe to leave it to the public to expose the fraud. The Act itself is a direct bribe to deception. Every consideration of justice and economy, of wisdom and patriotism, demands its repeal.

E. S. COWLES.

FARMINGTON, CT.

Notes.

It is good news that the Rev. B. F. De Costa, D. D., will become the responsible editor of the *Magazine of American History*, having as his assistant Mr. Henry P. Johnston of the New York Free College. We must not, however, forget the eminent services to the magazine and to American history of the late editor, Mr. John Austin Stevens. May we bespeak the attention of the new conductors to the unlovely aspect of the standard page of the magazine—faulty, as it seems to us, in its proportions and in the typographical character!

Charles Scribner's Sons have in press Mr. Froude's biography of Thomas Carlyle, for simultaneous publication with the English edition. In their pretty series of uniform reprints of Dr. Holland's complete works the story of 'Seven-oaks' is the latest issue.

The fourth volume of the "Geoffrey Crayon" edition of Irving's 'Life of Washington' has now left the press of G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Stuart portrait and the Ceracchi bust are among the numerous illustrations on steel of this part of the work. They have added to their previous list of the works of Edmondo de Amicis his 'Morocco,' published by Cassell & Co. some two years ago.

The Messrs. Putnam's new announcements include the long-expected work by Lieutenant-Commander Henry H. Gorringer, on 'Egyptian Obelisks: Their History and Characteristics.' The size will be folio, and the number of plates forty-nine, two-thirds of which are full-page artotypes. The removal and setting up of the Central Park obelisk will naturally be minutely described. The edition will be limited. Another significant work will be 'Our Merchant Marine: its Rise, Progress, and Decline,' by David A. Wells. Add also the following: Alphonse Courtois's 'Political Economy in One Lesson,' translated by Worthington C. Ford, who is preparing for the same publishers an 'American Citizen's Manual'; 'The Present Religious Crisis,' by Augustus Blauvelt; Leslie Stephen's new treatise, 'The Principles of Ethics'; and S. S. Cox's 'From Pole to Pyramid.'

D. Lothrop & Co., Boston, announce 'The Mother's Record of the Mental, Moral, and Physical Life of Her Child,' apparently a modification of Dr. Fossagrives's 'Livret Maternel,' already englished in the 'Mother's Register.'

George W. Harlan has in press a translation of Georg Horn's 'Count Sylvius,' this novelist being little known to American readers; and 'Last Days of Knickerbocker Life in New York,' by Abram C. Dayton.

We have received a touching memorial of the late celebration of Longfellow's seventy-fifth birthday (February 27) in the shape of the programme of the order of exercises at the Perkins

Institution for the Blind, at South Boston, Mass., and a dialogue prepared to be spoken by the inmates by Mrs. Julia R. Anagnos. Both these pieces were printed in raised letters on the Howe Memorial Press. The dialogue involves the whole or portions of the poems "Prometheus," "The Building of the Ship," and the "Psalm of Life."

Hardly inferior in curiosity to the foregoing is the Sale Catalogue of the late Prof. Dr. Bluntschli's library, which comes to us from Heidelberg. This octavo volume, of more than 200 pages, is autographically lithographed, but happily in Roman and not in German script. The last number is 2,141, and in the confusion of the entries it appears to be also the highest. Five pages at the end enumerate the works composed by Bluntschli himself, and his learned addresses. Among the latter we notice 'The Formation of the American Union,' 'The Services of Francis Lieber to Political Science and International Law,' and 'The Alabama Question.' It were greatly to be wished that this fine collection of works could be secured for America. Of the nine classes into which it is divided, eight are legal, historic, politico-economical, metaphysical. Belles-lettres and miscellaneous fill nearly twenty-four pages. English works are almost wanting.

We have still something to learn of the Germans in the production of cheap books. It is easy to lower the price, but to maintain style and quality and not to forsake cloth covers for paper, is as yet difficult for our publishers. Spemann's one-mark volumes are still an unsurpassed model in this regard, and now the great Stuttgart house of Cotta has begun a 'Library of Universal Literature' (*Bibliothek der Weltliteratur*), which will embrace in uniform style the works of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Shakspeare, Molière, Calderon, Dante, Platen, H. von Kleist, Chamisso, Körner, and Lenau. Mr. Christern sends us the first volume, neatly bound in wine-colored cloth, and sold here at forty cents as the equivalent of the mark, with transportation and duties thrown in. It is one of thirty-six to be devoted to Goethe, and makes a beginning of the poems. The form is handy enough for a coat-pocket, the print clear, the paper excellent, the whole tasteful and a real book. The library will be complete in 110 volumes, and subscribers to the whole will receive gratis four volumes of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, and Shakspeare biography; but subscriptions can be partial, or single volumes will be sold, still for one mark each.

From the Messrs. Rivington, London, we have a plump school edition of the First Part of 'Faust,' which many a solitary reader will find helpful, so copious are the notes—too frequent and too minute, one would think, for the best discipline in the language. They are, however, filled with many interesting comparisons, and there are various historical and chronological appendices, with some attempts at poetical renderings. The various stages of the drama are introduced by "arguments."

—The Federal structure of the nation sometimes perplexes science, as well as politics, seeking a desirable end. Just now the National Board of Health, acting in coöperation with the American Public Health Association and with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is trying to devise a practical method of establishing a general and efficient system of vital statistics. The collection of these incidents—that is, of births, marriages, and deaths—serves two objects: first, they are social statistics, identifying the individuals for judicial purposes—that is, for purposes of record; and then they have a scientific value, in that the individuals appear simply as units, and, being discussed in the aggregate, illustrate the great vital and eco-

onomic curves of national progress. With registration for identification the general Government has no concern: that affects only the States and their subdivisions. But it is of national interest to preserve the other phase of those facts, and to have them arranged for intelligible comparison, not only reciprocally, but with similar figures collected in other lands. Dr. Billings, charged with the study of this matter for the National Board of Health, has reported to that body his conclusions, as follows: That it is best to use the State machinery by paying to the States at the rate of \$2,500 per million inhabitants for such statistics as are required. This he estimates to be about half the cost of collection—the States now bearing the whole cost. He would not pay for imperfect work, the receiving authority being the judge. He would make the National Board of Health, or a permanent branch of the Census Bureau, the recipient, and he regards \$25,000 as sufficient to begin the work if Congress will authorize it. One great difficulty is that only about half a dozen States have anything like satisfactory registration laws, and for a long time to come the returns cannot be national. But as it is the first step that costs, it is the first step that begins a great work. Nothing will be accomplished if we wait until a perfected system can be applied. There is every reason to believe that the American and British registrars are in substantial accord as to the nomenclature and classification of diseases, and that a report now in preparation when published will supply a uniform plan to be used by the English-speaking and ultimately by the Continental nations. Of the value of trustworthy vital statistics to sanitary and political science nothing need be said; and if the general direction of the project remain with the gentleman whose name has been mentioned, it is pretty certain that the most intelligent and at the same time most practical scheme will be evolved.

—The numerous instances of late in which the Signal Service has predicted (for New England, for example weather) the precise opposite of that which happened, suggests the query whether such misleading is not unnecessarily increased by the present manner of connoting the subdivisions of the national domain. A prophecy applying to a very small area is more liable, if wrong at all, to be completely wrong, than one which covers a larger territory, some part of which may conform approximately to its terms. It will not from any cause be questioned that a uniformity in size of subdivisions is desirable. The difficulty would arise in drawing boundary lines. Should boundaries be geographical and follow divides (as on the present weather maps), or social and political (as in our atlases), or meteorological, with reference to the average direction of atmospheric movements; or should they be opportune to what is likely to prove lucky? As between these four conflicting methods, the real purpose of the service would be best subserved by what might be denominated opportunism. But, before this could be adopted, the style of subdivision third in the order just enumerated would most likely have to be experimented with. Its application would consist in paying exclusive heed to the quarters from which storms first enter the United States, and naming subsequent regions by eight-hourly progress from these starting points. Thus, in winter, when storms originate on the water, and therefore the Pacific and Gulf States have the initiative in them, the first eight hours' average journey from either coast might be termed the Windward District; and the last eight hours', comprising, perhaps, the eleven States northeast of a line drawn from Cleveland to Washington, the Leeward District. In summer, Kansas, Nebraska,

and Dakota would constitute the Initiative District. But no system can succeed under the present arbitrary custom of "reducing" barometric readings to what they "would be" if a place were at sea-level and of standard temperature. Under this custom, areas of low pressure will always seem to suffer grotesque changes of all kinds—direction, size, and unity—whenever they advance to regions where conditions will require them to incur a great "reduction." So long as this manipulating of the figures is considered necessary, the safest manner of dividing (safest not merely for the reputation of the leaders but for the profit of the led), would be empirical: let districts where experience has shown most errors to be made be either cancelled, or apportioned out among the neighboring divisions—as in political gerrymandering.

—It has been difficult to make out from the accounts of Mr. Wilde's appearances in Western cities whether he was really having a nice æsthetic time, or whether the coarse, unfeeling vulgarities among whom he was laboring were "making it hot" for the æsthete "under the old Flag." All doubts, however, have been set at rest by the æsthete himself, in a pleasant letter addressed by him to Joaquin Miller, whom he met and loved in this city, and now, it seems, even in far St. Louis, yearns to meet again. For himself and "the cause" he says he has "no fear as regards the future," and the reasons he gives are strongly put. He admits that in one or two insignificant towns there has been some "petty and profitless vulgarity," but he declares that he should think it as absurd to regard this as an indication of the "real spirit of a sane, strong, and simple people" as to "judge of the strength and splendor of sun and sea by the dust that dances in the beam and the bubble that breaks on the wave." "Slaver and folly," says Mr. Wilde in his simple early-English way, "have their way for a season," but his time is much occupied, and he has none to waste on "the few provincial newspapers which have so vainly assailed me." He has a few incidental remarks to make, however, on an "ignorant and itinerant libeller of New England," who, it seems, has been "lecturing from village to village in ostentatious isolation," though in connection with what lyceum bureau Mr. Wilde does not say. He does not mention his name either, but describes him as a "literary gamin," and his talk as mere "brawling," "mouth-ing," and "chatter." He expresses a desire to know who "this scribbling anonymuncle" is, that he "should write of him"—a question which, however, hardly calls for a reply from Mr. Miller, as it is unlikely that he can furnish any information of which Mr. Wilde is not already in possession. In fact, what Mr. Wilde does not know about him may be described as not worth knowing. He is, it seems, an "apostle of inhospitality," and, worse than this, "delights to defile, desecrate, and to defame the gracious courtesies he is unworthy to enjoy"; and Mr. Wilde asks Miller to tell him how, "youth being so glorious, art so godlike, and the very world about us so full of beautiful things, and things worthy of reverence, and things honorable," one should stop to listen to the "lucubrations" of this person. How indeed? But his name ought to be given. He cannot really be an anonymuncle. There can hardly be more than one such creature in the lecture field in what Mr. Wilde handsomely calls "grand old Massachusetts." If the following rather pointed inquiry addressed by Mr. Wilde to Mr. Miller—"Who are these scribes who, passing with purposeless alacrity from the police news to the Parthenon, and from crime to criticism, sway with such serene incapacity the office which they so lately swept?"—is intended to cover his case, it

would look as if the fellow stuck at nothing. His being a criminal is not, perhaps remarkable, and that may account for his interest in police news. But why should he sweep out offices? Can Mrs. Howe throw any light on these points? The letter will be interesting to her, for it contains not only this strong, manly denunciation of his Massachusetts slanderer, but a suggestion here and there of possibilities in the way of that charming innocent prattle which so delighted his Boston hostess. But at this, of course, he is better when anonymuncles do not rouse him to indignation.

—A law passed some years ago to define more particularly the status of the staff corps of the navy has recently been the subject of administrative interpretation, with the result of causing such a rearrangement of the junior medical officers as could not have been originally contemplated, and as works in the case of many a grievance and, it would appear, in the eyes of nearly all, an unfortunate change. It has been the custom, founded on orders and enactments, since 1824, for newly-appointed assistant surgeons to take rank with each other according to the time at which they passed the examining board, all those entering within one year being regarded as the class of that year. After three years they are reexamined to determine their fitness to remain in the service and to receive further promotion. They thus become "passed assistant surgeons." Now, it has been the custom to make this examination also a test of the comparative as well as the absolute merits of these officers, and to assign them positions of relative seniority by commission accordingly. Of this they were apprised upon entering the service, and it is supposed that the prospect of gaining or losing rank, as the case might be, has had a beneficial influence upon their habits of study and their professional life. The legal question, however, having been raised, the Attorney-General decides that the law of 1871, enacted for a different purpose, by its terms forbids any rearrangement among themselves of those once commissioned. As they were appointed in the order of time, so must they remain, irrespective of the action of any later examining board, only provided they can reach the minimum degree of merit that permits their retention. Hence, to take a suppositive case, the man who enters in February of one year must take precedence over him who entered in November of the same year by as many numbers as there have been successful intermediate candidates, although the November man may stand first and the February man eighth in order of merit as determined by the triennial examination. Naturally, those who lose rank by this new reading of the eleven-year-old statute feel aggrieved—for the whole list of passed assistant surgeons is being rearranged—and, as becomes high-spirited men, it is said that most of those who would be helped by it are indisposed to avail themselves of its provisions. The officers interested are seeking legislative action to make the existing law conform to the ancient usage, which it would seem the interest of the service requires; and, as no appropriation of money is involved, it is probable that a temperate and simple explanation of the facts would lead to the asked-for relief at the hands of Congress.

—The *Cologne Gazette* of February 11 contains an article on Berthold Auerbach by one of his most intimate friends, Paul Lindau, in which the following points are of interest. Until within two or three years, Auerbach had preserved a youthful freshness and vigor quite remarkable for his years. Then suddenly, almost in a day, he became a decrepit old man, propped on a heavy cane, short of breath, and evidently de-

siours of the end. Hardly another man was so painfully affected by the anti-Semitic agitation as he, the Jew and German poet. To this topic he ever recurred with fresh complaint. At one of their last meetings Lindau urged him not to make it so much a personal matter; but Auerbach replied, "You cannot really understand how it does affect us. Here we have toiled all our life in the service of the German spirit, only to be told at the end, by the first vagabond: 'Pack up your bundle and clear out; you are not one of us.'" It was characteristic of Auerbach to attach importance to seeming trifles and make them an object of serious consideration. To this peculiarity his conversation owed much of its charm and suggestiveness. It was impossible to be with him five minutes without getting a picturesque simile, clever comparison, or happy thought to carry away in the memory. And these suggestive expressions were not in the nature of *aperçus*, but the product of incessant mental activity. Careless, every-day observations never crossed his lips. All he spoke was manuscript ready for the press. His invitations, congratulations, condolences were not of the stereotyped pattern, but partook of his individual peculiarities. Although hardly more than of medium size, there was something patriarchal about his whole appearance. He spoke slowly and cautiously, and even in a tête-à-tête he appeared to be addressing a large circle of hearers. In his dress he was peculiar—his coat always buttoned up to the neck—and Lindau says he could hardly imagine him in an overcoat of the period. Among his friends whose memory he especially cherished were Uhland, David Strauss, the sculptor Rietschel, and Ferdinand Hiller; and he was intimately associated with all the artists and authors in Berlin. He did not undervalue his own gifts, and often manifested his convictions on this point in a harmless and naïve manner. His slightly South-German accent he carefully and intentionally preserved to the end of his life.

—In the issue of January 23 the *Gegenwart* begins a series of articles in which prominent politicians, authors, savants, and artists are to give accounts of their experiences—their successes and failures, the circumstances under which their principal works were executed, their general aims, etc. The first of these *Autokritiken* is by Ernest Legouvé. It is entitled "Von meiner Collaboration mit Eugène Scribe," and gives some interesting details concerning the manner in which Scribe received and acted upon the advice of his friends in dramatic matters. The principal advisers of Scribe and of Legouvé himself were the young Mahéault, son of the director of the Théâtre-Français, and Germain Delavigne, brother of the distinguished dramatist. Germain and his brother Casimir used to meet Scribe every Thursday to discuss plans for new plays, criticize manuscripts, and exchange hints or even subjects—as, for instance, the "Diplomatist," the plot of which Scribe had obtained of Casimir in return for his "Princesse Aurélie." One day Casimir came to Scribe in great mental agony because he could not find a situation for the last act of one of his plays. Scribe replied that he was just completing a vaudeville the dénouement of which would equally suit his piece. It was accepted, and the public did not discover the fraud, although the comedy failed, whereas the vaudeville proved a success. Scribe was always ready to profit by every good piece of advice, but impatiently rejected whatever seemed to him trivial or inconsistent with his talent and style. Germain, after hearing a new piece, was immediately ready with his criticisms, whereas Mahéault always took the manuscript home and made a careful ex-

amination of it. Legouvé is in possession of a number of note-books containing his analyses, often of ten or twelve pages, of manuscript plays by Scribe.

—The meeting of the Royal Astronomical Society in January was largely devoted to the discussion of a paper by Mr. Maunder, of the Greenwich Observatory, on the employment of photography in observing the transit of Venus in December next. Attention was called to the fact that the coming transit would occur at very nearly the epoch of the maximum solar activity, with every probability, therefore, that there would be a fair number of spots and faculæ—the chief feature of Mr. Maunder's paper being the suggestion that these markings should be used as reference-points for the planet, instead of measuring the distances from Venus to the sun's limb, as was done with the photographs of the transit of 1874, which (in the case of the English parties) gave most discouraging results. It does not appear, from what the Astronomer Royal said on that occasion, that the British expeditions would not employ the photographic method at all. However, from the *Procès-verbaux* of the International Conference for the Transit of Venus, 1882, held in Paris in October last (recently published by the French Ministry of Public Instruction), this method of observing the transit was plainly in disrepute with the members of the Conference, and photography was not recommended, although it was recognized that it might prove useful at certain stations. If by "photography" was meant the form of its application in the British observations of the transit of 1874, we should unhesitatingly commit ourselves to this same conclusion, which, nevertheless, could not have been reached by any but a conference which closed its eyes to the results obtained from the employment of the photographic method which is distinctively American. All this is very easy to understand, however, on the simple statement of the fact that the United States had no representative in this conference.

—At its second session, the President, M. Dumas, announced that the French Government intended to occupy stations in Florida, Cuba, Martinique, and Mexico, and four others in South America; Dr. Foerster, of Berlin, stated that Germany would occupy two posts in the Southern United States, one in the Argentine Republic, and one at the Falkland Islands; the Danish Government and that of the Netherlands would each equip a single party; Spain intended to organize two stations, one at Porto Rico and the other in Southern Cuba; the Austro-Hungarian Government would send an expedition to South America; observations would be made at Coimbra and Lisbon, and perhaps also in one of the Portuguese colonies; and, finally, Mr. Stone, of Oxford, the Chief of the British Transit of Venus Commission, made a report of the stations proposed by the English Government, sixteen in number, the principal centres being the Cape with three stations, Australia with the Observatories of Sydney and Melbourne, New Zealand, and the Antilles. Expeditions were also proposed for the Bermudes, Madagascar, and possibly the Falkland Islands. The most important outcome of the Conference, however, is probably that suggested by M. Hirsch, of Neuchâtel—viz., the advisability of creating an international bureau des calculs, to discuss not only all the observations of the coming transit, but those of the transit of 1874 as well. The Conference finally expressed the wish that the French Government would consent to communicate, through diplomatic channels, with such other governments as were represented in the Conference, or who might be interested in the transits of Venus, in order to submit to them the proposition for

convoking an International Conference on the Transits of Venus, after the return of the 1882 expedition, that an understanding might be established as to the means to be adopted to obtain the best and promptest use of the observations of the transits of 1874 and 1882, and in particular to inquire if it would not be well to create a temporary international bureau for that purpose.

—Madame Patti, "the Paganini of vocal virtuosity," as a Russian critic has justly called her, was never heard to such advantage in this city as on Thursday, when she appeared at the Germania Theatre as *Rosina* in the "Barber of Seville." The history of music records many operas which were composed with especial reference to the gifts and peculiarities of some distinguished prima donna. Rossini's popular comic opera was not written for Adelina Patti, but all its vocal and dramatic traits are so admirably adapted to her style and manner that no one would be surprised if he were told that she sat as a model before the Italian master while he sketched his score. It was difficult to decide what most to admire in her *Rosina*, whether her gay, mischievous, coquettish conduct in general, or the occasional expression of pouting impatience at the impertinence of her guardian. For once she disdained to distract attention from her features and her singing by the constant change and display of elegant and expensive toilets and jewelry. In the simple girlish attire of *Rosina* she looked again as she must have looked in the prime of her youth and beauty; and as she lightly tripped across the stage, warbling with all the ease and freedom of a canary bird, the most austere critic must have forgotten for the moment the aesthetic objections that can be urged against her art-career. It is all nonsense to talk about the lost beauties of Patti's voice. We did not hear her ten years ago, but we cannot believe that her voice was more perfect than it is to-day. Of course no singer's voice at forty is the same as it was at twenty; but in Patti's case the probable loss of some of the sparkle of the higher notes is more than compensated by the sonority and richness of the lower notes. Her registers are so beautifully equalized that a superficial observer may easily be led to assume that their clang-tint is identical and invariable. More careful attention, however, shows—what the use of a Helmholtz resonator would doubtless prove with scientific exactness—that whereas her matchless high staccato notes have the soft and simple tone-quality of a flute, her middle and lower notes are characterized by the presence of those overtones which give to the tones of an old Italian violin and viola that peculiar richness we all admire so much, because every single note here is a full chord in itself. In the "Ombra Leggiera" from "Dinorah," which she introduced in the music lesson, the perfection of her vocalization was most fully displayed, and her "efforts" (which apparently were no efforts at all) were rewarded by a double encore, and by applause which was as demonstrative as it was genuine. The support, as far as chorus and orchestra went, was much better than on Monday night, and reflects credit on the conductor, Signor D'Auria. The acting by the assisting vocalists was tame and seldom funny.

—Three orchestral and three vocal numbers were on the programme of the Symphony Society's fifth concert—the Introduction and Finale from Wagner's "Tristan and Isolde," Goldmark's "Sakuntala" overture, and Beethoven's Third Symphony; the air "Furibundo spirò il vento," from Handel's "Partenope," and two songs by Schumann—"Ich grolle nicht" and "The ring upon my finger." Although the Introduction to "Tristan and Isolde" is, of course, in-

tended to be played at the opening of the drama, there is yet a disadvantage in having it at the head of a concert programme, because the musicians have not yet "warmed up" to their task sufficiently to infuse into the wondrous bars of this composition the volcanic fire and passion demanded by them. With the regular orchestra at a German opera-house the case is different, as the musicians play together every evening, and therefore remain warm all the time; although even in their case it is to be noted that the last act of an opera is almost invariably played with more vigor and spirit than the first. To this fact in part may be attributed the comparatively unsatisfactory interpretation of this sublime composition, and the equally grand finale, on Saturday evening. Contrary to the usual custom, it was better done at the rehearsal on Thursday afternoon than at the concert. The finale was taken a trifle too slow, the rhythmic nuances were not all observed, the grand climax was imperfectly led up to, the melody was not always sufficiently accentuated and dwelt upon, and there were even some positive omissions and wrong notes that did not improve the general effect. The reception of this number was, therefore, naturally not so enthusiastic as it always is at Vienna, for instance, where it gives rise to scenes of wild excitement when played by the Philharmonic Society, under Hans Richter's direction. The Beethoven symphony was interpreted in a more artistic manner, as was also the "Sakuntala" overture, a piece which is much more effective to-day than it will be ten years hence. Goldmark might be called one of the popularizers of modern music. Without possessing any marked originality, he cleverly assimilates the latest harmonic, melodic, and instrumental inventions of greater minds, and presents them anew in an easily intelligible form. To a certain extent, therefore, his works may be compared to magazine articles on Darwinism or on some other modern scientific principle; and they are particularly useful to people who lack time or opportunity to go to the original fountains of ideas. In the absence of an analytical programme, the word "Sakuntala" is little more than a distinguishing title for the composition, which is really a sort of symphonic poem. Few people are sufficiently familiar with the contents of Kalidasa's drama of "Sakuntala" to judge of the appropriateness of the music; and the overture can therefore be judged by them only from a purely musical point of view. Of the vocal selections the Schumann songs, together with an encore, were well sung by Miss Lena Little. But the old-fashioned Handel air was neither well sung nor is it in itself a piece of any musical value whatsoever. Handel's broadly melodious arias are as good to-day as they were in his own time, and cannot be heard too often; but his highly ornamented rococo arias seem as unæsthetic and unnatural to our ears as a full-blown crinoline or Queen Elizabeth ruff would to our eyes.

—The "Historische Gesellschaft" of Berlin, which has for several years published a thin quarterly entitled *Mittheilungen aus der historischen Literatur* (containing reviews of new books, many of them of great value), began, four years ago, the publication of an annual survey of historical literature, under the name of *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft*. Two volumes (1878 and 1879) have already been published. The first volume was incomplete in some departments; the second volume is in sixty-eight chapters, grouped in the three divisions of Antiquity, Middle Ages, and Modern Times, each chapter under the charge of a specially qualified person—as, Jirecek for the Southern Slavs, and Wattenbach for Palæography. These editors are taken from all parts of Ger-

many, sometimes even from other countries. The work is for the most part compendiously done, and we notice that this is especially the case with the United States; even a volume of over 800 pages does not allow a detailed discussion of all that has been accomplished in the field of history. In many cases, however, we have clear and valuable statements of the net results to historical science of the labors of the several authors. An index gives the title and page of every book noticed.

GARDINER'S CHARLES I.—I.

The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I., 1637-1649. By Samuel Rawson Gardiner, LL.D. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1882. 2 vols.

OF Mr. Gardiner's noble labors in the service of historical truth, and of the rich fruits which these labors have already borne, no one can speak or write except in terms of the profoundest respect and admiration. His spirit of laborious research, of perfect truthfulness, and of student-like seriousness is absolutely above praise. The results of his studies are already more than a sufficient reward for twenty years of earnest work. He has not, indeed, produced books which sell like a new novel, and which with the charms have many of the defects of romances. He has not startled the world with a single new paradox, or, what is much the same thing, perplexed the world with a single new fallacy. He has not wasted ingenuity in proving that Charles was the best and wisest of kings, nor has he attempted to establish in epigrammatic sentences that good histories must of necessity be dull, or that Mr. Cobden was as true an historian as Lord Macaulay. These and the like achievements he has left to litterateurs or professors, and instead of entertaining has instructed the world, by placing before every intelligent reader by far the best statement to be found in the English language of the ascertainable facts with regard to English history, from the day when James I. ascended the throne to the day when Charles I. hoisted his standard at Nottingham.

If such an account contains of necessity many more facts which are true than which are new, let no one suppose that it is wanting either in freshness or interest. Intelligent students can hardly study Mr. Gardiner's volumes without feeling that in some respects their views of the Stuart period undergo a change. The facts are set clearly before the reader's eyes. Different persons will, according to their different judgment or bias, draw different conclusions from these facts. Few, it is probable, will in all respects agree with Mr. Gardiner's own inferences; but every one will feel that from this author he receives what is a much better thing than any inference which an historian can draw—the facts on which a thoughtful man can form a judgment for himself. The one complaint which a person bent solely on the search after truth can make of his guide is, that Mr. Gardiner has, to a certain extent, confused the duties of a fair historian with the totally different duties of a charitable and sympathetic moralist, and has thus in his very passion for fairness shed a kind of moral haze over persons and events that ought to be looked at simply in the dry light of historical narrative. The complaint is, as far as it goes, a true one, and those who most cordially admire Mr. Gardiner's work, as also the spirit of his workmanship, may feel that because of their respect for his labors they can criticise, and ought to criticise, with freedom a fault which, if fault it is to be called, is but the exaggeration of a virtue, and flows from that passion for sympathetic analysis which is the peculiarity of our day. The aim of this

article is to show by a few examples the nature of the fault which may be imputed to Mr. Gardiner, and the mode in which it affects his views of English history.

Mr. Gardiner brings out with extraordinary clearness a circumstance which, it may be suspected, many of his readers have never realized—viz., that Charles betrayed Strafford chiefly out of fear of the mob:

"All day long the street in front of Whitehall was blocked by a shouting multitude. Every minute it was expected that an attempt would be made to dash in the doors. The mob took up the cry that the Queen-mother was at the bottom of the mischief, and guards had to be despatched to St. James's to preserve her from attack. . . . It was nine in the evening before Charles, wearied out with long mental conflict, gave way at last. 'If my own person were only in danger,' he said, with tears in his eyes as he announced his resolution to the Council, 'I would gladly venture it to save Lord Strafford's life; but seeing my wife, children, and all my kingdom are concerned in it, I am forced to give way unto it.'"

"Charles sinned against his conscience. Let him who has seen wife and child, and all that he holds dear, exposed to imminent peril, and has refused to save them by an act of baseness, cast the first stone at Charles."

It is the last words (not, of course, underlined by Mr. Gardiner) which exhibit in an exaggerated form his misconception of an historian's proper functions. Charles's course of action was thoroughly base. On this there is no question whatever. For Strafford's offences Charles was personally responsible. He had engaged to protect Strafford's life; he had undoubtedly the legal right to do so. Men in whom he could trust told him his duty:

"Juxon advised him to refuse his assent to the bill. Williams argued that the King had a public as well as a private conscience, and that he ought to submit his judgment to those who were learned in the law. . . . Charles still hesitated; his soul was wrung with agony. The Bishops were summoned a second time. This time Usher was amongst them, and Usher sided with Juxon. Williams persisted in the view which he had taken of the King's duty."

No person believes that Charles let Strafford die out of respect for law. Charles's own words, reported by Mr. Gardiner, strike away his last excuse. The King let a servant whom he believed to be innocent go with his assent to the scaffold, because he feared for the life of his wife and children. These are the admitted facts, stated with the utmost honesty by Mr. Gardiner. Then what is the meaning of Mr. Gardiner's reflection? The baseness of Charles's act nothing can palliate. Reference to the spirit of the age tells more against the King than for him. Whatever the faults of the seventeenth century, it was a time when persons of high position were trained to high physical courage, and Charles's whole theory of life rested on the personal power and personal responsibility of the Crown. Mr. Gardiner's moral reflection amounts to this—namely, that under Charles's temptations, if his character, training, and position be taken into account, we might any one of us have acted as basely as he did. Grant for a moment that this is so: the plea which is made for Charles may be made in favor of Catiline, of Borgia, of Robespierre, of Lefroy, of Guiteau—of any criminal, great or small, who has ever existed or ever will exist. Whether this kind of defence, which, if it avail any one, is available for every one, deserves the consideration of moralists, may be a question. That it is quite out of place in the mouth of an historian is obvious. Moral guilt—that is, the amount of blame which a man may deserve for his faults or his vices in the eye of Heaven, or in the judgment of his own conscience—is not a matter of which an historian can be the judge. What a narrator of past events is bound to do,

as far as it lies in his power, is to narrate these events with complete accuracy and truthfulness, to tell his audience what were the actions of the men of the past, and to trace as far as may be the motives from which these actions probably proceeded. In analyzing these motives he must often dwell on the difference between the sentiments of different ages, and therefore, no doubt, will indirectly in some cases lessen and in others increase the condemnation with which we regard the crimes of other times. But the narrator's duty is to narrate, not to judge. Once let him fancy that it is his function to estimate moral guilt, and it is more than probable that even his account of facts will suffer from an unconscious moral bias.

It is, for example, in the instance under consideration, somewhat difficult to feel sure that Mr. Gardiner has not overrated the imminence of the peril under which Charles's courage gave way. Until the outbreak of the Civil War he was always, unless it be on the very occasion when Strafford's life was sacrificed, personally free. His position was utterly different from that of Louis XVI. before the flight to Varennes. He conspired against the Parliament; he attempted to arrest the five members; he made open preparation for civil war. Yet neither the Parliament nor the London mob dared lay a hand upon him. His death was admittedly a shock to the vast majority of the English people. Is it easy to believe that in May, 1641, the Parliament or the city would have tolerated the murder of the King, his wife, or his children?

"Ruinous as his [Strafford's] success would have been, in his devotion to the rule of intelligence he stands strangely near to one side of the modern spirit. Alone amongst his generation, his voice was always raised for practical reforms. Pym and Hampden looked upon existing society as something admirable in itself, though needing to be quickened by a higher moral spirit and to be relieved from the hindrances thrown in its way by a defective organization. Strafford regarded that society as full of abuses, and sought, in the organization which was ready to his hand, the lever by which those abuses might be removed. In happier times Pym and Strafford need never have clashed together, save in the bloodless contests of Parliamentary debate."

Here, again, is seen Mr. Gardiner's leaning toward a mistaken standard of fairness. It is certainly true that in modern times Pym and Strafford could clash only in bloodless contests; for the strength of the state happily prohibits every political contest which is not bloodless. But the impression which Mr. Gardiner's words are, one must take it, meant to convey is, that Strafford and Pym differed only in seeing different sides of truth. This impression, though happily rendered innocuous by the perfect truthfulness of Mr. Gardiner's narrative, is, to judge from that narrative itself, utterly misleading. Strafford may have possessed great administrative powers. One may well take Mr. Gardiner's word for this, though he does not make the grounds of his belief in Strafford's great talents quite so clear as could have been wished. But of Strafford's zeal for the public good; of his possession of any grand ideas of government whatever; of his enthusiasm for the rule of intelligence, it is all but impossible to find the proof in Mr. Gardiner's pages. The statesman who, without Laud's religious fervor, supported Laud's narrow scheme of church government; who, being supposed to entertain great schemes, was entirely wanting in patience, and constantly gave way to violent passion; who, being credited with high public spirit, supported the debasement of the currency; and who staked the safety of the Crown upon an utterly mistaken view of English feeling, has, to say the least, a very doubtful claim to the merit, what-

ever it may be worth, of standing near to one side of the modern spirit.

The plain fact appears to be that if men's actions and policies are to be judged historically, Strafford was, on the great issues of his day, as distinctly in the wrong as Pym was distinctly in the right. But this plain fact is exactly the truth which Mr. Gardiner, on principle, refuses to admit. He cannot believe that at any great crisis of human history parties were divided by the definite line of right and wrong. Profoundly impressed with the truth that the problems raised by the great rebellion were problems of great intricacy; still more impressed by the knowledge that good men and wise men took opposite sides in the contest which rent English society asunder, he apparently comes to the conclusion (which is in itself very doubtful) that there was as much goodness and wisdom to be found among the supporters of Charles as among the supporters of the Commonwealth, and impliedly draws the further still more doubtful conclusion that the virtues of the leaders on each side were equal. This idea is connected with a singular kind of optimism. Mr. Gardiner appears unwilling to admit that the undoubted failure of the Puritan movement worked any permanent injury to England. He intimates, in more than one passage, that the bitter experience of the Civil War led the English people to the discovery of the true cures for the political and the religious difficulties which perplexed and divided the men of the seventeenth century. The institution of the Cabinet removed the practical objections to Parliamentary government. The maintenance of a state church, surrounded by societies of tolerated Dissenters, satisfied the religious sentiment of the majority of the people, and at the same time recognized the claim to individual freedom of belief. Admit that a cabinet and the policy embodied in the Toleration Act afforded the true and satisfactory answer to the questions which divided Strafford and Pym, and the consequence appears not unnaturally to follow that you may sympathize both with the statesman who supported the prerogative, and with the statesmen who struggled to establish the sovereignty of Parliament.

Unfortunately, the optimistic view of English history is, like most forms of optimism, but partially true. Cabinet government is not without its evils; the ecclesiastical system under which the national church ceased to be the church of the whole nation, and Dissenters, giving up the claim to religious and civil equality, had to put up with mere toleration, is scarcely a system which has, or ever had, any title to be more than a very unsatisfactory makeshift. A writer less inclined than Mr. Gardiner to hold that there is good in all things might plausibly maintain that the partial failure of the Puritan revolution, or, in other words, the partial success of the cause represented by Strafford and Laud, has been the source of evils to England which the lapse of centuries has not entirely removed. However this may be, the crimes of Strafford can hardly be palliated by the fact that he did not foresee a system of government which, could he have foreseen it, he would in all probability have detested as heartily as does Prince Bismarck. Nor can the cruelties of Laud be made to lose something of their brutality by the undoubtedly true reflection that the Archbishop could not anticipate the day in which the Church of England would be rich and powerful while Independents and Baptists worshipped peacefully in their own chapels, undisturbed by any fear of losing either their goods or their ears.

Mr. Gardiner's conception of the kind of impartiality which ought to be displayed by a fair-minded historian, and also his tendency toward optimism, are each to a certain extent defects

which occasionally give a false tone or color to his judgment of men and of policies. But these defects are, after all, but slight faults. They are the result of an almost inevitable reaction against the over-confident dogmatism which has too often been the predominant trait of English historians. Mr. Gardiner commenced his labors some twenty-two years ago. "Macaulay and Forster were then in possession of the field. The worship of the Puritans was in the ascendant, and to suggest that it was possible to make out a reasonable case for Bacon and Strafford was regarded as eccentric. All this is changed now. Few are to be found to say a good word for Puritanism, and the mistakes of the Long Parliament are unveiled with an unsparing hand." "I have striven," he adds, "with what success I know not, to take a broader view of the deeds of the great men who made this England in which we live, and to realize and measure the greatness of Pym as I formerly attempted to realize and measure the greatness of Strafford." The attempt has been assuredly crowned with deserved success, and critics who think that even sympathetic advocacy has its weakness will recognize that Mr. Gardiner's treatment of a critical era has been such as to throw upon it a flood of new light.

MYRON HOLLEY.

Myron Holley; and What He Did for Liberty and True Religion. [By Elizur Wright.] Boston: Printed for the Author. P. O. Box 109. 1882. 12mo, pp. 328.

"The greatest of the three college-bred sons" of Luther Holley, of Salisbury, Conn., has hitherto eluded the drag-net of our biographical dictionary-makers. His two brothers and his present biographer (likewise a native of Litchfield County) already have a place in one or other of our American books of reference, and doubtless the eulogium before us will eventually cause the name of Myron Holley to be added to the printed roll of American worthies. Briefly, what Mr. Wright contends for is, that Holley, without originating the idea of the Erie Canal, was the most efficient and indefatigable promoter of its construction, under circumstances at once highly honorable and highly disastrous to himself; that he was the virtual founder of the Liberty party; that the State of New York owes his heirs the compensation which it denied to him; and that his character and public services entitle him to grateful remembrance by his countrymen.

In what Myron Holley "did for liberty" Mr. Wright would have us reckon the Canal itself. While the South, the Missouri Compromise gained, had large visions of Northern commerce bowing the knee to King Cotton, and Charleston rivalling the greatness of London and Rome—

"while the ingenious Southern statesmen were dreaming these dreams, Myron Holley was patiently and enthusiastically digging that ditch through the marshes and swamps of New York, which in 1825 was to let the enterprising, well-schooled white free laborers into the vast forests of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, and into the boundless prairies of Illinois and Wisconsin. These became rich States, while, as to the mass of the white population, all the South became poor. More and more the great trading metropolis of the East, New York, derived its wealth rather from this new West than from the South. By ten years after the Missouri Compromise, so cunningly contrived by Henry Clay, the North and New West were ripe for a moral movement to emancipate public sentiment from its servility to the slaveholders" (p. 228).

Mr. Wright gives a graphic picture of the Western wilderness to which the Canal furnished easy access, and quotes largely and discursively from De Witt Clinton's entertaining journal of the exploration of 1810 made by himself, Holley, and the other commissioners of that date along

the projected line of the Canal. The next episode in Mr. Holley's career was his earnest espousal of anti-masonry, consequent upon the disappearance of Morgan and the intense excitement produced by it in Central New York, where Mr. Holley's home then was. The last was his participation in the anti-slavery movement, in the winter of 1837-33, which we may assume to have been decided by the recent murder of Lovejoy, though Mr. Wright (pp. 239-243) connects it with Mr. Clay's presentation of the gag-law petition in February of the former year; his engagement as an anti-slavery lecturer; and finally, his proposal at a State Anti-Slavery Convention in Cleveland, in 1839, "to make an immediate nomination of President and Vice-President." Defeated here by his fellow-abolitionists, he succeeded later in a convention at Warsaw, N. Y., where "was made the first Presidential nomination for the celebrated 'Log Cabin and Hard Cider Campaign' of 1840," and James G. Birney's name was presented to the country for that office. This nomination was confirmed April 1, 1840, at Albany, by a Convention of which Holley was the master spirit—the head of the committee on business and resolutions, of which Mr. Wright himself was a member.

At this point the biography touches upon debatable ground in the history of the anti-slavery movement, and becomes a valuable, if one-sided, contribution to that history. We cannot go into the details of the great division of the abolitionists in 1840 into Old and New Organization. Mr. Wright candidly confesses that one of the motives of the secession—the prejudice against women as equal collaborators in the reform—was narrow and illiberal; but he leaves it to be inferred that time has justified the political motive. This, however, will, on impartial examination, prove not so clear as that an anti-slavery party was the inevitable product of the non-resistant, non-voting agitation steadfastly adhered to from 1830 to 1840 and *usque ad finem*. It is only fair to say that Mr. Wright's remarks on this score are not conspicuously in self-defence, and not at all in self-glorification where some of the praise which he accords to Holley should rightfully be also his own.

The private life of his hero is charmingly depicted with the aid of private letters not numerous nor intrinsically remarkable, yet well calculated to inspire respect and affection for the writer of them. What we gather from these and are told about his love of wife and children, his fondness for gardening and tree-planting, his simple goodness and absolute integrity, harmonizes well with the lineaments of his handsome face as perpetuated in the portrait which adorns this book. What is most extraordinary, therefore, is the fact, stated on the reverse of the title-page, that "three leading publishers, though guaranteed against loss, have declined to publish this book, either with or without the author's name." Mr. Wright's positive and incisive style, in which long practice as a journalist has made him a master (though he was never a 'prentice hand), is capable, certainly, of giving offence to more than one class of readers. For example, he says of Holley's abandoning the law: "He had an instinctive aversion to all crookedness. Whether he held that this disqualified him for a profession in which nothing is more indispensable to pecuniary success than a faculty of suppressing the truth and making the worse appear the better side, I find no record." But one could as soon conceive of a publisher's taking alarm at this sentence as the editor of "Harper's Drawer" rejecting a similar skit on the legal profession. Readers not ignorant of our inferior intellectual toleration in matters theological as compared with the mother-country, in spite of its state church, will

speedily conclude where the shoe pinched. What Myron Holley did for "true religion," as defined by his biographer, was undoubtedly the bugbear of the "three leading publishers"; and Mr. Wright's long public career and eminent and versatile services availed nothing against his heresy and that imputed to Mr. Holley. The latter was in truth a sober and reverent "Bible Christian," and what he did for religion thousands of heads of families have done as unostentatiously as he. He was opposed to "revivals" as, "on the whole, not promotive of religion or virtue," while very favorable to hypocrisy; and he severely and justly rebuked a schoolmistress who gave up the entire forenoon to a couple of male revivalists to work on the ignorance and fears of her pupils, his daughter being among the number. For the rest, bigotry would find it hard indeed to stigmatize him. Mr. Wright, in the pursuit of true religion, has gone an arrow's flight beyond; but as he is an American citizen of unblemished reputation, it should be a matter of general interest to discover what religious sentiments "leading publishers" are afraid to give currency to, even when guaranteed against immediate loss—in other words, what is the nature and extent of the censorship that tends to suppress a work designed to celebrate an undoubtedly noble and pure life, of great and lasting influence upon the destinies of the country. To this end, even more than because the proceeds of this publication, if any, are to go to Mr. Holley's heirs, we cheerfully comply with the author's request that we announce his readiness to send the book to any address on application as above, on receipt of one dollar and fifty cents, or of ten dollars for as many copies.

Catalogue of the Library of the Boston Athenæum. [By Charles A. Cutter.] 1807-1871. Parts 1-4. Boston. 1874 [1872]-1882. Pp. 3404. 8vo.

THE history of the Athenæum Catalogue, as briefly sketched by Mr. Cutter in the appendix, is a history of the science of bibliography during its progress. The original intention of the trustees, twenty-five years ago, was to print a simple list of authors and titles. But under the influence of the newly-awakened interest in libraries which began to be felt at that time, the plan broadened and extended until now the finished work marks the highest point yet reached in the art of cataloguing. This gradual development of the conception of what the catalogue of a general library should be, involved, of course, radical changes in its construction, which have not only added greatly to the labor of preparation, but have also caused certain imperfections that would have been avoided had the work been begun and finished on the same general system. There are, speaking generally, three kinds of catalogues: the simple list of authors or titles; the classified catalogue, in which the books are put under their various subjects, as Theology, History, Travels, etc., and the dictionary catalogue. Mr. Cutter has adopted this last form, in which the names of authors, the titles of books, and the subjects are all arranged in one alphabet. This is obviously the simplest method, and combines most of the advantages of the classified catalogue. It has never before been carried to such an extent in a printed catalogue. The contents of the various collected works—the publications of learned societies, public documents, etc.—are not only given in full, but are also carefully analyzed, and placed under both author and subject. The writings of the leading essayists, and the important articles in some of the prominent serials, are treated in the same manner. Scattered throughout the volumes are many explanatory and bibliographical notes, drawn from every

source open to the bibliographer. The classification of books under their subjects and the subdivision of these subjects have been by no means the lightest or the least valuable part of Mr. Cutter's labors. Theology, for instance, fills more than twelve pages, and is divided into eight heads, while the titles on the United States fill 108 pages under 141 heads. Great pains have also been taken in the endeavor to discover the names of the authors of anonymous and pseudonymous works. The typographical execution of the catalogue is most praiseworthy, especially in the excellent selection of different kinds of type to discriminate between the various classes of entries. Great success has also been attained by similar means in making the contents of long serials, etc., easily intelligible. Of the general accuracy of the catalogue it is difficult to speak too highly. There are errors, of course. In a work of this magnitude, containing a quarter of a million separate entries, this is inevitable. But, after a careful examination, we have not found a single blunder such as disfigures many excellent catalogues, and few errors which are not obviously mistakes of the copyist or printer.

While thus testifying to the general excellence of Mr. Cutter's work, on which he has expended an amount of labor, of patient investigation, of careful thought, which will never be known except to himself, and will be appreciated at its true value by but few, there are some points on which we shall venture to take exception to his methods. We do so with less hesitation because the Athenæum Catalogue will naturally be taken as the standard to which, for years at least, other cataloguers will look for guidance in their work. Our principal criticism is that it is a mistake to give bibliographical details in cross-references. It adds largely to the expense and increases the bulk of the catalogue—a very serious matter merely as regards convenience of consultation—without corresponding advantages. To take an illustration selected at haphazard, Froissart's 'Chronicles' are entered in full under *France* and *Great Britain* as well as under *Froissart*. Here, in the course of 200 pages in the same volume, twenty lines are taken up with purely bibliographical matter twice repeated, when a single line in each case would have called the attention of the student of French or English history to the 'Chronicles.' For the information about the various editions he need but turn a few pages to the original entry. "Charles F. Adams' Platform," a political pamphlet, is entered in full three times in the same volume under *Adams*, *Charles*, and *Buffalo*, and also, under *United States*. A minor objection is that the scientific classification of books under their subjects is at times too rigidly adhered to. The necessity for a minute and careful classification is obvious, but the cardinal rule to be observed in a catalogue for general use is, after all, simplicity. To make clear our meaning, Prescott's 'Conquest of Mexico' is not to be found under *Mexico*, but under *Cortez*, to which title the inquirer is referred from *Mexico*. Occasionally there is a marked inconsistency in this respect, as, for instance, this same author's 'Ferdinand and Isabella' is to be found under *Ferdinand*, but not under *Spain*, while his 'Reign of Philip II.' is to be found under both *Philip* and *Spain*. Then, again, we must strongly object to giving foreign names in any other form than that by which they are generally known to English readers, as Raphael, not "Raffaello"; Michael Angelo, not "Buonarrotti"; Livy, not "Livius." It is at least questionable, too, whether the works of George Eliot should be put under a name, Lewes, which was never legally hers, and by which not one reader in ten thousand would know her, or those of

George Sand under Dudevant. Mr. Cutter has placed the titles under subjects chronologically, not alphabetically. There are some advantages in this method: it gives an interesting bird's-eye view, as it were, of the progress of knowledge on that subject, and enables one to detect instantly the latest work upon it. But the difficulty of finding a given title among a large number of similar ones is often great, and the departure from the alphabetical arrangement which prevails elsewhere is, on the whole, confusing to the user of the catalogue.

Of the necessity of devising some universal catalogue, or at least some system of coöperative cataloguing, we are more than ever convinced after seeing the large and costly work which the proprietors of the Boston Athenæum have published. There can really be no absolute need that a large part of the revenues of every considerable library should be spent on a separate catalogue when the books are mainly the same in each. This at least is certain: the contents of the various great collected works, serial and society publications, which are given here, need not be repeated in the printed catalogue of any library which possesses these volumes, as a reference to the Athenæum Catalogue will be sufficient. We are not then without hope that, with the rapid increase of bibliographical helps to students, a simple and inexpensive method of cataloguing an ordinary miscellaneous library will be discovered. It may take the form of a list of standard works on every subject, with ample references to all the trustworthy sources of knowledge. This would probably index the larger and most used part of the contents of every public library, while the simple addition of shelf-marks would make it ready for use. Such a list, a revised edition being published annually, would not only greatly diminish the running expenses of our libraries, but would of course prove of great assistance to all students.

Events and Epochs in Religious History. By James Freeman Clarke, author of 'Ten Great Religions,' etc., etc. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1881.

THE title of this book prepares us for the inconsequent and varied character of its contents. It is made up from a course of lectures given by the author in the Lowell Institute, Boston, in January, 1880, and there is nothing in the character of the lectures to prevent the supposition that they were all composed within the month, and that much of the information in them was collected at the same time, and that still the author, who is the diligent preacher and pastor of a Boston church, had time enough remaining for his sermon writing and parochial cares. But what is much more likely is, that the different lectures were prepared without any reference to each other along the course of many years, and that the opportunity to deliver a series of lectures before the Lowell Institute first suggested their juxtaposition. They are of unequal value, yet must all of them have been interesting and instructive to the people who heard them delivered, and will prove so to many others in their present form. A certain scrappiness is common to them all. They have not the flow and continuity which mark the previous books of the same author. The effect of scrappiness is heightened by the inclusion in some of the lectures of two or three different subjects, any one of which would be ample for an hour's discourse. In one lecture Augustine, Anselm, and Bernard are treated together; in another, with more evident excuse, Luther and Loyola.

Some of the lectures have resulted from much

wider study than others, and more profound deliberation. The two lectures on the Catacombs belong in the first rank. At the close of these, certain inferences are drawn from the catacomb inscriptions which do not seem unfair. They are that the Christianity of the catacombs was much more ethical and social, much less theological and ecclesiastical, than that of later times; that the primacy of Peter and the worship of Mary formed no part of the Christianity of the early Empire. Dr. Clarke is nothing if not liberal, and on page 31 he puts in a tender plea, that may possibly be shocking to some of his Protestant friends, for the Roman Catholic custom of praying for the dead. The logic of the situation seems to be entirely on his side. Lecture iii., upon "The Buddhist Monks in Central Asia," is not a little suggestive of the famous treatise upon "Snakes in Ireland." Something about Buddhist monks is quoted from the well-known description of Father Hue, but the lecture is for the most part concerned with other things, the leavings, as it were, of the author's lecture on Buddhism in his 'Ten Great Religions.' The lecture on Monasticism must be regarded as extremely superficial. No justice is done to the philosophical and social inspirations of the early monachism, nor is any allowance made for New Testament warrant which some of the wisest—Origen for example—found, or thought they found, for extreme asceticism. Thoreau is introduced as the last of the monks, and Emerson as the last of the mystics, in another lecture in which the delicacy and subtlety of the subject are in striking contrast with the treatment it receives. The lecture upon Savonarola does not impress us as having gone so near to the heart of the matter as George Eliot in 'Romola.' "In a divided age he was a whole man," is Dr. Clarke's concluding sentence. In the fact that he was not a whole man—that, ethically grand, he was intellectually superstitious and fanatical—a better judgment finds the tragedy of his inner life.

Dr. Clarke is very fond of contrasts and comparisons, and he is often happy in the way of these, but not always. Surely nothing could be worse than this, on page 135 (he is speaking of Augustine): "We ask whether the sons of Africa can ever be elevated to our level, and behold, an African intellect is the ruler, almost to our time, of Christendom!" Hundreds of persons who heard the lecture are probably laboring to this day under the misconception, a natural inference from our quotation, that St. Augustine was a full-blooded negro. Of minor blemishes, the misspelling of Lucretia Mott's name is one of the most unaccountable. In Emerson's famous quatrain from the "Voluntaries," quoted page 117, "boy" is no improvement upon youth in the last line. When every abatement has been made, the book is overflowing with its author's geniality and his sympathetic spirit. Its value is not a little increased by twenty plates, eighteen of which are heliotypes. Here is a method of illustration that is inexpensive, and might be utilized much more frequently than it is, greatly to the reader's advantage. The woodcuts in the article on Monasticism are better calculated to make an impression on the memory and imagination than many pages of fine writing about the magnificence of the abbeys of Brussels and Clairvaux. Two heliotypes are given of Savonarola, one of which is badly reproduced upon the cover. There is nothing in either of these suggestive of George Eliot's face, but plenty in another, for which one of these might fitly have been spared.

Eugene Onegin: a Romance of Russian Life in Verse. By Alexander Pushkin. Translated from the Russian by Lieut.-Col. Spalding. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

COLONEL SPALDING's translation is probably one of the fruits of the general reawakening of interest in Pushkin in his own country. Twenty months ago a memorial of him was erected in Moscow, and its completion was made the occasion of very widespread and heartfelt eulogy of him. At St. Petersburg, Turgeneff made a most felicitous and pathetic address. 'Eugene Onegin' is by no means the best introduction to Pushkin's works. The fragments Sir John Bowring translated years ago have far more of fire, and such a poem as 'The Gypsy' far more of picturesque effect. As to the merit of the translation, it seems to us another example in support of the argument in favor of abandoning the attempt to render verse in verse. Were it not better to seek to preserve the poetic spirit rather than to sacrifice it to the attempt to express it in an alien form? Poetry in the sense of *Dichtung* is the common possession of all languages, and as such is independent of verse.

The original is exaggerated frequently, too often with the effect of degrading it. Narrow space prevents many illustrations, but any page will afford one. Monsieur l'Abbé, "a Frenchman poor," is made "a starving Gaul." "In the depths where with you I swim, dear friends," becomes

"In that morass where you and I
Wallow, my friends, in company."

This is the more surprising as the noun translated "morass" (*omut*) is so literally "a depth" that it is the word of the proverb, "V' tskloy vodye omuti glutokie," which is our "Still waters run deep."

A more serious liberty with the original is the attempt to make a continuous whole out of what the author himself considered but a fragment. In the Russian, whole stanzas are wanting, their places being indicated by numbers. Among Pushkin's papers were found many stanzas which had once belonged to it. Eighteen are continuous, and would have made part of another canto, "The Pilgrimage of Onegin." Pushkin seemed to regard Onegin as a friend and confidant, and to have entrusted to him everything without reserve, always intending to make over the work into a perfect whole—a purpose not abandoned even when the last part was printed in 1832, seven years after its commencement. To present such a fragment as a whole is in itself an injustice.

The *parti pris* of the translator is evidently the explanation of the tone of the work. His view is that Pushkin imitated Byron—Onegin is Don Juan; hence copy, if possible, the spirit and language of that poem. This is really to premise that Pushkin imitated Byron's faults, and only his faults. To say that he did not imitate Byron would be to deny his own words. The first outcome of all literary activity in Russia in the first quarter of the century was to follow foreign models. It was the inevitable result of the first close contact with the western world. There is a sketch by Pushkin of the same date as the conclusion of this poem, for a novel to be called 'The Russian Pelham.' It is far more like Bulwer's work than 'Onegin' is like 'Don Juan.' The mistake is not in saying he was an imitator; it is in supposing that he was nothing else. To prove his independence of Byron intellectually and morally, one need take only this poem.

The story in brief is this: Onegin, weary, world-worn, seeks relief from ennui in the retirement of the country with his friend, the young poet Lenski, by whom he is introduced to

his betrothed and her sister Tatiana. With self-disregard of consequences, he wins the love of the latter. In innocence and confidence she confesses it to him unsought. To her mortification and grief, he listens coldly, then insists with biting scorn upon the ills of marriage and his own repugnance to it. Months after, Onegin reappears with his friend at Tatiana's birthday fête. Perhaps goaded by conscience to some excess, he wantonly picks a quarrel with Lenski, kills him next day in a duel, and leaves the country. Olga recovers first from the blow, and marries another suitor. Tatiana is heart-stricken, and would have died but for the intervention of friends who take her to the gay world of Moscow. It "met her smilingly," and in time she marries a general and a prince.

Onegin returns to Moscow and finds the little country-girl in the first splendor of success as the *grande dame* of society. She scarcely notices him. He falls blindly, madly in love. His repeated letters receive no answer, and at last, in despair, he resolves to force an interview with her. Chance favors him, and he enters her boudoir unannounced. He finds her in tears. He throws himself at her feet. It is now her turn to listen, but there is no triumph in the revenge which time has thus wrought for her. She silences him imperatively, even while in deepest sorrow; she admits that she loves him now, as she has always done, and must always do. Yet with unshaken firmness she insists: "But to another I am given, to whom I shall be true for ever." She leaves the room, and there the poem ends. Much as there is in common in the character of the two heroes, surely this is not the story of Don Juan.

The book can have but a curious interest for us, who are so far from the life it describes; but in Russia it is the best-known and oftenest-quoted of Pushkin's longer works. Its descriptions of city and country are current coin in literature; and the initiated read between the lines much of the social history of the dark days in the beginning of Nicholas's reign. As regards the place which Pushkin himself should hold in a final judgment, it is difficult for foreigners to understand the enthusiasm of his countrymen, until one realizes that it was he who first woke them to a sense of their language as a poetic language; that he is, as Turgeneff calls him, "not only the poet of the people, but the national poet." He came before the light, and he came by himself. After fifty years the Russians still listen to him as to a voice singing alone in the darkness.

Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution.

By I. Gould Schurman, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Arcadia College. London: Williams & Norgate; New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 1881. Pp. 103.

THE author, manifestly a young man just home from foreign study, after declaring Professor Zeller, of Berlin, "the foremost thinker of modern Europe," and Mill and Hamilton to have mainly an historical interest for our generation, attempts to show the defects of the Kantian, and still more of the Spencerian, ethics, and proposes partly as a union of, but more in place of both, the rightly-developed Aristotelian principle of the "idea of man as such." By his theories of spontaneity in the understanding, and especially of autonomy in the pure will, Kant neglected the empirical element. His categorical imperative requires us to act, or to realize thought, but gives us nothing to realize; and its universality is so abstract that anything might become a moral law. By ignoring the pleasurable as impure, his principle becomes formal, empty, and essentially subjective. The true principle of

"man as such" is not Comte's *grand être*, but is family, state, church, society, or Schleiermacher's "ethical goods," so that the individual has not to create a morality from within, but to make his own the concrete morality of his country embodied in these institutions. This is essentially the principle which Trendelenburg used to express in his lectures; and a famous Hegelian sentence of his is quoted, that "no other task can be given to man than the realization of the idea of his own worth, and that no other than this can be comprehended, no other recognized, by him." And again: "An ethical philosophy which would exclude pleasure would be contrary to nature, and one that would make a principle of it would be contrary to spirit."

This is all clearly, and we believe truly, said. The radical defect of Kant's ethics is delineated in a reverent way, which, in point of spirit, and often even of manner, is a model of philosophical criticism, and which goes far to disarm the prejudices with which one takes up most of the many digests, popularizations, and expositions of the now much-digested and exposed German idealists. Hence we regret all the more that the writer has fallen into the popular dogmatic tone in discussing the 'Data of Ethics.' We have no predilection for Spencer, but it is high time to protest against the "utterly utter" method of treating him which convicts him of every species of absurdity by some rapid and indiscernible legerdemain, as in the Arabian tale in which the adversary was cut through and through by a blade of such infinite thinness that, if challenged to shake himself, he would fall apart in slices. Our author compares Spencer's system to an "acoustics of color"; finds in it a "naïveté that is really surprising"; tells his readers that it "empties morality of all its content," and "suppresses all that is most characteristic in morality." It does not even "explain development nor heredity." Nervous modifications, we are told, "cannot, properly speaking, be accumulated or transmitted," and "in the light of reason the whole process reveals itself as illusory." Fundamental positions are "obviously" wrong, and only "slight surveys" reveal their shallowness. In short, instead of being a serious and laborious attempt to explain moral and psychic facts, which commends itself to many very respectable thinkers, the only inference from these pages is that it is a tissue of errors and absurdities. Now philosophy will never get beyond individualism and provincialism—Hegel's animal kingdom of mind—till each thinker confines himself to a field so narrow that he can make himself an authority in it, and learn respect for those who labor in other departments. The mind is larger than all the sciences together, and its students should learn solidarity, and remember, as the old German proverb tells us, that beyond the mountains that limit their horizon there are people.

Scotland in Early Christian Times. (Second Series.) The Rhind Lectures in Archaeology for 1880. By Joseph Anderson, Keeper of the National Museum of the Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1881.

IN the present volume the subject of the author's Rhind Lectures for 1879 is continued, and his main thesis further developed with illustrations from a wider field. In the ecclesiastical remains of Scotland in her early Christian times—the illuminated MSS., bell shrines, crosiers, and reliquaries which he then examined with great scientific acumen and research—he found relics of a culture which exhibited a feeling for decorative art, a faculty of design, and a skill in the technical processes of art-workmanship sufficient to excite admiration at the present day. The

stream of culture must, however, have steadily increased. Somehow—and it would be interesting to know how, since artistic progress means also progress along other lines—between the seventh century, the period of the best illuminated MSS., and the tenth or twelfth century, a transition occurred. The art, previously circumscribed by ecclesiastical limits, became more secular, and its sphere was correspondingly enlarged. It is this development from an ecclesiastical to a national school of art, from the illumination of MSS. to the most exquisite art products in jewelry and sculpture, that forms the subject of the present series of lectures.

The first lecture treats of the remains of decorative metal-work in gold, silver, and bronze in the shape of brooches, etc., which, amidst their variety, possess a typical form and all the essential characteristics of the art of the MSS. The other lectures are devoted to the remains of decorative stone-work—the monuments, their art, their symbolism, and their inscriptions in Celtic and Oghams, and in Runes and Roman letters, respectively. From these it is clear that the sculpture of the period also has an individuality of its own. Even the symbolism of the monuments is unique. It has much in common with the symbolism which occurs on all early Christian monuments, but it has also a local and conventional character, and the meaning of many of its symbols is at present veiled in mystery. Moreover, in general design as in minute details, the decorations of the monuments "are similar in style of treatment and manner of composition to the illuminated pages of the Celtic MSS." And there is ample evidence that the art brought to such perfection by the scribes passed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries to both jewelry and sculpture.

This school of decorative art in Celtic Scotland was singularly original. Its characteristic features—its interlacing, fretwork, and spiral ornamentation—are found over a wider area; but they were never developed into "a systematic style of art" elsewhere, nor do they give a distinctive character to any other than Celtic art. This art attained a high perfection. "No other monuments," says Mr. Anderson, "are characterized by such a lavish profusion of adornment." And he adds, again with a pardonable enthusiasm, but in too sweeping terms:

"A legacy of art like this of the monuments—although its scattered materials lie here and there in fields, in hedges and ditches, by lonely roadsides, or in nettle-grown corners of country churchyards—is really a school which has many and varied capabilities of public utility, and is therefore a possession of which any nation might well be proud. It constitutes a wealth of material which no other nation possesses, or can ever hope to possess. Three hundred examples of an art like this represent a collection of art-materials such as has not fallen to the lot of any other nation of northern Europe. They are materials of such intrinsic value and suggestiveness that our designers, sculptors, and jewellers are willing to borrow inspiration from them. I believe that I am correct in saying that no variety of ancient art-workmanship is more generally imitated at the present day, and that the closer the copy the better the work. The formation of such a gallery of art-materials in the country to which they are indigenous would not only restore to the native genius of the Scots the original elements of that system of design which are its own special inheritance, but it would also be an epoch in the history of art itself."

Artistic as well as literary forms are a permanent expression of a nation's life; and these Celtic remains are valuable from an archaeological and historical as well as artistic point of view. Mr. Anderson has summarized many interesting details brought to light in the study of them (p. 122).

Glossary of Technical Terms, Phrases, and Maxims of the Common Law. By Frederic Jesup Stimson. Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1881.

THIS Glossary is said to be the result of an attempt to produce "a concise Law Dictionary, giving in common English an explanation of words and phrases, English as well as Saxon, Latin, or French, which are of common technical use in the law." It will be found a convenient hand-book. The chief criticism to which it seems to be open is that in the selection of catchwords too great importance has been given to initial prepositions. For instance, under the word *de* we find several pages of phrases beginning with *de admensuratione dotis* and ending with *de warrantia diei*, containing several dozen in all; but in none of them is the preposition the important word, or necessarily the word which remains in the memory, and therefore it would have been better to arrange them under the real catchword, with cross references to the prepositions, or *vice versa*. The volume seems to contain almost all the Latin phrases in ordinary use. The value of a familiarity with these at the present day is differently estimated by lawyers. Those who have a classical education will always be apt to think that legal propositions cannot be intelligently grasped by persons to whom Latin is an unknown tongue. On the other hand, there have been at least one or two great lawyers whose unfamiliarity with it was a by-word. Lord Kenyon used Latin entirely at random, the classical phrases with which he was in the habit of closing his finest periods having absolutely no relation to the sense of their contents, as in the case of his celebrated charge to the jury: "Having thus discharged your consciences, gentlemen, you may retire to your homes in peace, with the delightful consciousness of having performed your duties well, and may lay your heads upon your pillows and say, '*Aut Caesar aut nullus*'"; and his delightful translation of the phrase, "as plain as the nose on your face," by "*latet anguis in herba*." There is said to be in existence, though out of print, a collection of Latin law maxims by an old practitioner, in which the maxim *Catella realis non potest legari* appears in English as "A genuine little whelp cannot be left in a legacy"; *Messis sequitur sementem*, as "The harvest follows the seed time"; and *Actor sequitur forum rei*, as "The agent must be in court when the case is coming on." The first of these, by the way, we do not find in Mr. Stimson's collection.

The Evelyns in America. Compiled from Family Papers and other Sources, 1608-1805. Edited and annotated by G. D. Scull. Printed for private circulation, by Parker & Co., Oxford. 1881. 8vo, pp. 392. (250 copies.)

In 1879 Mr. Scull printed the 'Mémorial and Letters of Captain William Glanville Evelyn,' a volume of 140 pages. Reprinting this, he now adds a copy of a paper by the late Sebastian F. Streeter on George Evelyn, the first commander of Kent Island, in Maryland, from 1636 to 1649, originally issued by the Maryland Historical Society in 1868; a reprint of the rare 'Description of New Albion,' published in 1648; a letter from Robert Evelyn, who lived in America from 1638 until 1648; together with letters of Colonel Harcourt written in 1776-7, during his service in this country in the British Army; extracts from the journals of Captain John Montresor, an officer of Engineers of the British Army serving here both before and during the Revolution; brief memoirs of other British officers who belonged to the forces engaged in that struggle; a memoir of Robert Evelyn, who was the first

of the family to come to this country, settling in Virginia in 1608; and a short notice of the last Evelyn here, William, an officer in the British Army, who lost his life by shipwreck on the island of Cape Breton, Canada, in 1805. Thus we have the different members of an old English country family more or less connected with this country for two centuries. Nearly all the material here brought together has been gathered in successive visits at Wotton, the home of the Evelyns, and at Nuneham, the home of the Harcourts; and it is characteristic of the pride taken by the heads of these houses, that both the text and the illustrations, consisting of portraits, maps, and views, have been largely furnished in proof of the interest felt in reviving the memories that thus unite the two countries in common history.

The narrative of the experiences of the earlier Evelyn visitors belongs to that antiquarian and almost traditional period of American history which is sure of the attention of a few earnest students. The story of poor young Captain Evelyn is full of pathetic interest. He was a gallant soldier who had given promise of a successful future by his share of the campaigns on the Continent, and whose career was cut off by his untimely death in New York, from wounds received in an engagement on Long Island. Even his grave is unknown, although it is certain that he was buried in New York. His letters are full of characteristic touches. Landing in Boston, he at first adopted the view common with all he met, that the outbreak of the rebellion was premature, and that peace would soon be restored. He lived long enough to see and acknowledge that the struggle was in dead earnest, and that it would need judgment at home and ability in the field to bring the operations of the British forces here to a successful conclusion. Captain Montresor had even better opportunities of forming a right judgment on the subject, for he spent twenty years here in engineering service, built the works at Mud Fort on the Delaware in 1772, planned the operations by which it was reduced in 1777, and was the principal engineer of the British forces. His note-book furnishes interesting memoranda as to the character and actions of the prominent commanders of the English army. As early as 1773 he was offered a tempting position by the Pennsylvania authorities, but this he refused, "from the appearance of the times, savoring much of an Inclination to Rebellion." He is as sharp in criticising the American as the English leaders, and sums up the matter as a "String of Blunders, wound up by the greatest Blunder of all Blunders, a blundering, disgraceful Peace."

Mr. Scull has shown great industry in collecting the material of his volume, and it is to be hoped that he will revise and recast it in such shape as will make it a book likely to command an early publication through the ordinary channels, and thus become accessible to the public. One thing suggested by it is that what Kapp has done in scholarly fulness in his lives of the German officers who served in the Revolutionary War, and in his account of the curious career of Bollmann, still remains to a very large extent to be done both for England and France. The Rochambeau Papers, now deposited in the Congressional Library at Washington, waiting the tardy action of Congress on the offer of its present owner, ought to supply much material of an interesting kind. The 'Life of Fersen,' by Klincksowström, showed the part taken by that enthusiastic lover of France in the campaign of the French forces here. The letters and memoirs of Miot de Melito relating to his stay in this country will, if published, no doubt give a vivid picture of life as he saw it. Meanwhile, the capacity of Americans as buyers and readers of

books such as Mr. Scull's 'Evelyns' can hardly be gauged so long as the work remains "privately printed."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Abbott, Alice Irving. Circumstantial Evidence. New York: W. B. Smith & Co.
American Classics for Schools. Longfellow. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 60 cents.
Beard, G. M. Trance and Muscle-Reading. New York: The Author.
Brockhaus's Conversations-Lexikon, Parts 8-10. New York: L. W. Schmidt.
Brook, Sarah. French History for English Children. Revised ed. New York: Harper & Bros. \$1.
Chicago River and Harbor Convention of July, 1847. Chicago: Fergus Printing Co. \$1.
Clarotte, Jules. Monsieur Le Ministre. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. 75 cents.
Dingy House at Kensington. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 60 cents.
Donnelly, L. Atlantis: The Antediluvian World. New York: Harper & Bros. \$2.
Doubleday, Gen. A. Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. \$1.
Ebers, G. The Burgomaster's Wife. New York: Wm. S. Gottsberger.
Ellis, A. B. History of the First Church in Boston. Boston: Hall & Whiting.
Fox, Caroline. Memories of Old Friends. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
Goadby, F. The England of Shakespeare. New York: Cassell, Putnam, Galpin & Co.
Goethe's Sämtliche Werke. In 60 vols. Vol. I. Stuttgart: Cotta; New York: F. W. Christern. 40 cents per volume.
Green, J. R. The Making of England. New York: Harper & Bros. \$2.50. (Also, Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.)
Harte, B. Poetical Works. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$2.
Hartshorne, H. Our Homes. American Health-Primer Series. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston, Son & Co. 30 cts.
Hay, Mary Cecil. Among the Ruins, and other Stories. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 15 cents.
Hayman, Rev. H. The Odyssey of Homer. Vol. III. Books xlii-xxiv. London: David Nutt; New York: B. Westermann & Co.
Hoar, G. F. James Abram Garfield. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 50 cents.
Hornum, R. The Banker's Almanac and Register for 1882. New York: Office of Banker's Magazine.
Jennings, A. C. Ecclesia Anglicana: a History of the Church in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. New York: Thomas Whitaker. \$2.25.
Johnson, F. True Womanhood: Hints on the Formation of Womanly Character. Cambridge, Mass.: Moses King.
Johnston, Elizabeth R. Original Portraits of Washington. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. \$10.
Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Max Müller's Translation. 2 vols. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. \$5.
Kingsley, Rev. C. Westward Ho! Hypatia. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan & Co. \$1 each.
Lansdell, H. Through Siberia. In 2 volumes. With illustrations and maps. \$8.
Lubbock, Sir J. Fifty Years of Science. Address before the British Association. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 75 cents.
Mearns, J. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 2 vols. \$10.
Meadell, J. P. Old Greek Education. New York: Harper & Bros. 75 cents.
Marriage and Parentage, and the Sanitary and Physiological Laws for the Production of Children. New York: M. L. Holbrook & Co.
Moncrieff, F. C. Wit and Wisdom of the Bench and Bar. New York: Cassell, Putnam, Galpin & Co.
Monce, Incandescent Electric Lights. New York: D. Van Nostrand & Co. 50 cents.
Morawetz, V. Treatise on the Law of Private Corporations other than Charitable. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Morley, H. English Literature in the Reign of Victoria. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.
Morris, W. Hopes and Fears for Art. Boston: Roberts Bros. \$1.25.
Myron Holley: and What He Did for Liberty and True Religion. Boston: Ellizur Wright, P.O. Box 100. \$1.50. 1881.
Nicol, H. J. Great Movements, and Those who Achieved Them. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Parkman, C. M. The Works on the Cross: Seven Sermonettes. New York: Thomas Whitaker. 60 cents.
Patton, J. H. Yorktown: Account of the Surrender of Cornwallis. New York: Ford, Howard & Hulbert.
Patten, A. A. The Art of Voice-Production, with Reference to Correct Breathing. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.
Perkins, W. O. Vocal Echoes for Female Voices. Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co.
Price, T. B. Snap. The Ox-Train Era. New York: W. B. Smith & Co.
Proctor, R. A. Familiar Science Studies. New York: R. Worthington. \$2.25.
Public Papers of Governor Cornell, 1880. Albany: Executive Office.
Stoker, B. Under the Sunset. London: Sampson Low & Co.
Thomas, Mary Von-Eden. Winning the Battle; or, One Girl in Ten Thousand. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. \$1.25.
Three Christmas Sermons, by Three Sons of Leonard Bacon. New Haven: Edward P. Jud.
Toussie, A. W. John Sax and Mamelon: or, The South without the Shadow. New York: Ford, Howard & Hulbert. \$1.
Turner and Morhead. Goethe's Faust. Part I. The Text, with English Notes, Essays, and Verse Translations. London: Hingstons.
Wheeler, C. G. Familiar Allusions. A Hand-book of Miscellaneous Information. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. \$3.
Williams, Rev. J. The World's Witness to Jesus Christ: Bedell Lecture for 1881. \$1.
Woodward, Prof. C. M. History of the St. Louis Bridge. St. Louis: G. L. Jones & Co.; New York: D. Van Nostrand.
Wordsworth, J. The One Religion: Eight Lectures on the Hampton Foundation, 1881. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$3.50.
Wright, W. A. Life of King Henry the Fifth. Shakespeare Select Plays. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Yonge, C. D. Constitutional History of England, from 1760 to 1860. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 25c.
Zola, E. The Mysteries of the Court of Louis Napoleon. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. 75 cents.

HENRY HOLT & Co.

WILL PUBLISH MONDAY:

John Stuart Mill.

A Criticism. With Personal Recollections. By Alexander Bain, Emeritus Prof. of Logic, University of Aberdeen. 12mo, \$1 25.

James Mill.

A Biography. By Alexander Bain, Emeritus Prof. of Logic, University of Aberdeen. 12mo, \$2.

D. Appleton & Co.

Have just published:

I.

The Rhymester;

Or, THE RULES OF RHYME. A Guide to English Versification. With a Dictionary of Rhymes, an Examination of Classical Measures, and Comments upon Burlesque, Comic Verse, and Song-Writing. By the late Tom Hood. Edited, with Additions, by Arthur Penn. 18mo, cloth extra (uniform with 'The Orthoëpist' and 'The Verbalist'), price \$1.

Three whole chapters have been added to this work by the American editor—one on the sonnet, one on the *rondeau* and the *ballade*, and a third on other fixed forms of verse; while he has dealt freely with the English author's text, making occasional alterations, frequent insertions, and revising the dictionary of rhymes.

II.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED.

Shakespeare from an American Point of View;

Including an Inquiry as to his Religious Faith and to his Knowledge of Law; with the Baconian Theory considered. By George Wilkes. Third edition, revised and corrected by the author. 1 vol. 8vo, cloth, 484 pages, price \$3 50.

III.

History of France.

New volume in "History Primers," edited by J. R. Green. By Charlotte M. Yonge. 18mo, cloth, flexible, price 45 cents.

For sale by all booksellers, or sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers,
1, 3, and 5 Bond Street, New York.

NEW ENGLISH BOOKS

At 25 Cents to the Shilling.

Sent, post-paid, direct from London, on receipt of price of publication in bankers' draft, currency, or post-office order.

The recent Custom-House and Post-Office Circulars permit all printed matter to be mailed to the United States with safety and economy, and the duty, if any, to be collected from addressees. Stevens's Priced List of nearly 500 English, French, and German Periodicals, with fuller Announcement for supplying books by mail or freight, is distributed gratuitously by every public library in the United States, by Tice & Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York, and B. F. STEVENS, American Library and Literary Agent, 4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England.

THE

Principles of the Law:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE LAW OF PERSONAL RIGHTS,

To discover the Principles of the Law, as ascertained from the Practical Rules of the Law, and harmonized with the Nature of Social Relations.

BY A. J. WILLARD.

[From the Philadelphia Press.]

"A calm, dignified, able, and exhaustive treatise of a subject which is of great importance to every one. Mr. Willard first discusses the nature and origin of rights, obligations, and powers of fundamental social law and institutional law. He then expounds the science of the law, and defines the nature of all species of obligations and contracts. A general view of rights and powers is then brought forward, and a consideration of their special functions—as, for instance, the use of air and water and the principles of individual sustenance. The doctrine of individual redress and protection is thoroughly examined, and a long and interesting discussion follows of nuisances, wrongs, and injuries. The characterization of duelling, and the pithy and convincing way in which its absurdity is shown, are admirable. The final chapters are a logical deduction of what has gone before, and the doctrine is applied to all sorts of contracts, such as marriage, which is defined as 'an individual association for cooperative purposes,' the family and communal and general association. The treatment of the subject is so clear and logical, so simple and scholarly, that it deserves the highest praise. It is a work such as Aristotle might have written, had he lived in this latter day."

Octavo, cloth, price \$2 50.

For sale by all booksellers; or sent by mail, post-paid, to any address in the United States, on receipt of price.

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers, 1, 3 and 5 Bond Street.

A Book for Every Family.

THE UNIVERSE; or, The Infinitely Great and the Infinitely Little. From the French of F. A. Pouchet. 8vo, with 270 illustrations, \$3 75.

"An admirable work. . . . The illustrations are excellent."—*London Times*.

"A sterling work, thoroughly accurate, and fresh and vigorous in style."—*Popular Science Review*.

"Will interest old and young in the works of the Creator."—*The Standard*.

For sale by all dealers, and sent by mail, on receipt of price, by the publishers.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

27 and 29 West Twenty-third Street, New York.

TO BOOK-BUYERS, LIBRARIANS, Etc.

JAMES THIN, Bookseller,

55 South Bridge, Edinburgh, Scotland. Issues periodically Catalogues of Standard and Useful Books in all departments of Literature, Ancient and Modern, which he will be happy to send, post-free, on application.

*Books not in stock sought after and collected. Gentlemen having lists of books wanted are respectfully requested to send same, and prices, etc., will be reported without delay.

P.S.—200,000 volumes of New and Second-hand Books always on hand.

DAVID G. FRANCIS,

17 Astor Place, Eighth Street, New York.

DEALER IN NEW AND OLD BOOKS.

PRICED CATALOGUES, containing valuable standard literature, as well as rare, curious, and out-of-the-way books, are issued from time to time, and will be forwarded to any address.

BOOKS PURCHASED.

THE PEOPLE'S LIBRARY AHEAD.

Number 205 of the People's Library contains the

Eulogy of President Garfield

By Hon. JAMES G. BLAINE.

Sold everywhere for 10 cents, or mailed, on receipt of 12 cents, by J. S. OGILVIE & CO., Publishers, 25 Rose Street, New York.

The Way of Life.

By GEORGE S. MERRIAM.

"For the sweet and generous spirit which pervades these pages no one can have any words but those of delight and praise."—*Congregationalist*.

"These letters make a fine addition to that sort of literature which meets the most exacting want of awakened minds. Their purpose is not so much to arouse and invigorate the will as to give rest to the heart; to create an atmosphere in which faith, hope, and love can breathe; to show a way through difficulties, and not around them; to teach us how to convert our burdens into wings."—*Christian Register*.

"Mr. Merriam's practical counsels are sometimes put with an epigrammatic force which almost entitles them to a place in the world's proverbs."—*Christian Union*.

16mo. Cloth, gilt top. \$1.

Sent by mail, postpaid, on receipt of price, by

GEO. H. ELLIS, Publisher,

141 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

A GENERAL INDEX

TO

The Nation.

From July, 1865, to September, 1880.

Net price (no trade discount), \$2 50. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the *Nation*, Box 794, New York, or Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine.

A BIOGRAPHY OF

The late Leonard Bacon

Seems to be called for by the many grateful and appreciative notices of his life which have recently appeared. Aid in preparing the work is earnestly asked of any persons who may have in their possession letters or other documents which can be of use. Such documents will be carefully preserved and returned if desired. They may be sent to the Misses Bacon, 247 Church Street, New Haven, Conn.

SECOND ANNUAL EXCURSION,
July 24 to August 24, Yellowstone National Park.
For particulars enclose stamp to
WILLIAM L. MARSHALL,
Fitchburg, Mass.

Printed by the Evening Post Job Printing Office, N. Y.

